Percy D. Beckwith

JEWISH SECTS AND PARTIES IN THE TIME OF JESUS

Jewish Sects and Parties in the Time of Jesus

By J. W. LIGHTLEY
M.A., B.D., D.Lit.

PUBLISHED FOR THE FERNLEY LECTURE TRUST

LIBRARY OF
UNITED THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY
BM
175
.A1
L5

LONDON
THE EPWORTH PRESS
J. ALFRED SHARP
1925

TO THE MEMORY
OF
W. L. AND M. L.

First Edition, 1925

Made and Printed in Great Britain by
The Camelot Press Limited, Southampton.

PREFACE

PORTIONS of the present volume were delivered as the Fernley Lecture at Newcastle-on-Tyne in 1919, and some apology, or explanation, seems to be necessary for the belated appearance of this book. The simple truth is that the manifold duties of my ministry have left but little time or opportunity for work of this nature, and it has even happened more than once that the subject has had to be laid aside for months at a time. It is conceivable, I suppose, that benefits may accrue from this slow-footed method of production, though it is not easy for the writer himself to discern them. But it certainly possesses some disadvantages, and should the reader discover reiteration here and there he may without difficulty surmise the cause, and treat it with indulgence.

The subject of the book arose many years ago out of my own ordinary studies. It became quite plain that any attempt to understand the Life and Teaching of Jesus would be hopelessly out of perspective without a fuller knowledge of the men amongst whom Jesus lived. What were their aims and ambitions, their principles, prejudices, and history, the grounds of their rivalry and antagonism? To become acquainted with their thoughts and motives, to see life from their point of view, if possible, would do something to make the atmosphere of Christ's life more real. Possibly there are to-day, among younger students, some who feel as I did.

The danger of bias, both in the arrangement of the facts and in judging them, has never been far from my mind, and I have striven to avoid it. Unfortunately, condemnation of the opponents of Jesus is unavoidable at times, but I have deliberately refrained from this wherever loyalty to the truth did not make it imperative. The Christian faith is altogether too firmly grounded to begrudge the most generous concessions to ancient opponents, and in so doing it only emulates its Lord.

The appended Bibliography will, it is hoped, be of service to readers in planning further study in an important and fascinating subject.

J. W. LIGHTLEY.

HARROGATE,
February, 1925.

CONTENTS

Part I

PHARISEES AND SADDUCEES

CHAP.		PAGE
	SYNOPSIS	6
I.	IMPORTANCE OF THE PHARISEES AND SADDUCEES; SOURCES	11
II.	OUTLINE OF THEIR HISTORY	17
III.	NAMES	26
IV.	ORIGIN	35
V.	PRINCIPLES AND DEVELOPMENT	53
VI.	DOCTRINES	75
VII.	RELATIONS WITH JESUS AND THE EARLY CHURCH: (*a*) THE PHARISEES	107
VIII.	RELATIONS WITH JESUS AND THE EARLY CHURCH: (*b*) THE SADDUCEES	153
IX.	GENERAL ESTIMATE	173

Part II

THE SAMARITANS

	SYNOPSIS	180
I.	INTRODUCTION	183
II.	SOURCES AND NAME	185
III.	HISTORY: (*i.*) ASSYRIAN INVASION AND ITS RESULTS	186
IV.	HISTORY: (*ii.*) INCIDENTS CONNECTED WITH THE REBUILDING OF THE TEMPLE AND WALLS OF JERUSALEM	194
V.	HISTORY: (*iii.*) RELIGIOUS FEUD AND FINAL SEPARATION FROM THE JEWS	205
VI.	HISTORY: (*iv.*) GREEK, EGYPTIAN, SYRIAN AND MACCABEAN TIMES	227

CHAP. PAGE

VII. HISTORY:
(v.) ROMAN AND LATER TIMES . . . 232
VIII. DOCTRINES AND INSTITUTIONS 237
IX. RELATIONS WITH JESUS AND THE EARLY CHRISTIANS 251
X. SAMARITAN LITERATURE 262

PART III

THE ESSENES

SYNOPSIS 268
I. INTRODUCTION 270
II. SOURCES OF INFORMATION 273
III. NAME AND ORIGIN 277
IV. HISTORY AND MANNER OF LIFE 282
V. BELIEFS 292
VI. NON-JEWISH ELEMENTS 307
VII. RELATION TO CHRISTIANITY AND THE EARLY HERESIES 319

PART IV

THE ZEALOTS

SYNOPSIS 324
I. INTRODUCTION 327
II. NAME AND GENERAL CHARACTERISTICS . . . 329
III. THE ROMAN GOVERNMENT AND THE JEWS . . 333
IV. THE MESSIANIC HOPE 343
V. BEGINNINGS OF REVOLT 357
VI. THE MOVEMENT DEVELOPS—PROVOCATION AND RESISTANCE 361
VII. AGRIPPA (A.D. 41–44)—A LULL IN THE STORM . . 369
VIII. SPORADIC REBELLIONS 371
IX. THE WAR AND THE DESTRUCTION OF THE JEWISH STATE 384
X. JESUS AND ZEALOTISM 388

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS 397
BIBLIOGRAPHY 398
INDEX 406

GENERAL INTRODUCTION

THE most absorbing study in the history of religions, at any rate for Western students, has for its object the person of Jesus Christ. He is Himself an inexhaustible subject, and it is fitting that He should have aroused in men of all types an inexhaustible interest. And, especially during the last few generations, no study has been more enthusiastically pursued. Geography, ethnology, history, the comparison of religions, the contemporary literatures of Jews, Greeks, and Romans, and now psychology, have all made valuable contributions, with the result that to-day Jesus is probably better known and understood than at any time since the death of His first intimates. Nor does this investigation appear to show any signs of exhaustion, for if the hopes and promises of the psychologists are realized, new points of view will yet be gained for the benefit and delight of future generations.

The investigation undertaken in the following pages is obviously historical. It has long been recognized that any thorough study of the Founder of Christianity must include His contemporaries, particularly the leaders of thought and action in His day. They influenced Him and He them. Jesus was no philosophical recluse, intent only on the study and proclamation of abstract truth without seeking to relate it to the actual struggles and needs of His contemporaries, and His words bear an immediate relation to the thoughts and movements of His time. Spoken at another time and under other conditions they would have been spoken differently. They were, in part at least, a reaction to the ideas and practices around Him. And the seeker after Christ's essential or fundamental teaching must often pierce this rind before he can reach the kernel. To investigate carefully these reciprocal influences is therefore an unavoidable necessity. Palestine was just then a seething sea of contending sects and parties, each with its own history, some acting openly, others secretly;

and the life, thoughts, feelings, and teaching of the new Teacher can only be properly appreciated when the influence of this atmosphere is felt and its component elements understood. To dissociate the words and deeds of Jesus from the circumstances amidst which they originated, is not only to run the risk of misinterpretation but of actual perversion of their meaning. They were never independent of time and place, but conditioned ; and the conditions need to be reconstructed as their background if we are to do justice to them and their author.

Then, too, justice must be done to those whom Jesus encountered in opposition and counter-opposition. It is not too much to say that this has yet to be accomplished. We know the vices of these opponents, and it is only fair that we should be equally acquainted with their virtues, of which there were many. The hypocrisy of the Pharisees, for instance, has become a byword in Christian lands, and yet when the great catastrophe of A.D. 70 threatened the Jewish faith with extinction, it was its Pharisaic elements which saved it. But a party whose chief characteristic was hypocrisy could never have accomplished so noble a task or grown to the dignity of a great world-faith—the cherished possession and sole religious hope of millions of human beings. We owe it therefore to ourselves, as well as to the truth, to discover the deeper and more spiritual elements in this party. Nor can Sadduceeism or Samaritanism be treated as of no account if, as may be contended, they constituted at different periods the older and more conservative side of the ancient Jewish faith. The Essenes and Zealots, alike in the intensity of their fervour, though strikingly different in its expression, have almost disappeared from the realm of Biblical studies. Yet each represented an extreme development of some of the religious tendencies of the period, and each, in its own way, made an important contribution to Jewish or Christian history.

A considerable quantity of Pharisaic literature has survived, which is all to the good, but unfortunately it is not checked and counterbalanced, as one could wish, by any adequate contributions from non-Pharisees. The extant Sadducean writings are very scanty and of a non-contentious character. The Samaritans, though jealously prizing such literary remains as they have, possess nothing sufficiently ancient to throw

much light on their origin and early development. The Essenes and Zealots are almost wholly devoid of literature of their own. In the case of the Zealots this is not so much to be wondered at, for their rôle was action not writing; but with the Essenes, men of books and meditation, it is somewhat extraordinary and greatly to be deplored. Without the much-criticized Josephus, therefore, we should be badly off, despite his obvious bias.

Our plan, as will be observed, is strictly historical. We have simply endeavoured to ascertain the facts in regard to each party, and allowed them to speak for themselves. With this object in view, considerable attention is devoted to investigating the origin and early development of each, and where later divergencies occur, these are carefully examined, and an attempt made to account for them. Of set purpose doctrines or special beliefs are treated before dealing with the relationship of the parties to Jesus, so that when this stage is reached the points of agreement and disagreement may stand out clearly and thus eliminate as far as possible the interposition of bias. The opposition between the two, in certain cases, is undoubted, but nothing is to be gained by emphasizing it.

An examination of the Bibliography will show how considerably the literature on our subject has grown in recent years, but the discussions are mostly scattered over several volumes or are found in different parts of the same volume. However little, therefore, the present discussion may contribute to the settlement of the various questions still in dispute, the writer hopes that the treatment of these matters, in one volume, may have some value for the reader.

PART I

PHARISEES AND SADDUCEES

SYNOPSIS OF PART I

CHAPTER I

Importance of the Pharisees and Sadducees, and Sources

PAGE

Importance. To the understanding of Judaism—And of the New Testament: Sadducees responsible for public worship; Pharisees and their Scribes the popular teachers—Opposition 11

Sources:

(1) Josephus: War, Antiquities, Life—His defects . . . 13

(2) Apocalyptic and Pseudepigraphical literature.—Sadducean: Ecclesiasticus, 1 Maccabees, Zadokite Fragment. Pharisaic: 1 Enoch, Testaments of Twelve Patriarchs, Psalms of Solomon, 2 Maccabees 14

(3) New Testament: Synoptic Gospels—Acts 15

(4) Rabbinical literature 15

CHAPTER II

Outline of their History

1. First appearance—Second half of second century B.C.—Quarrel with John Hyrcanus—He becomes a Sadducee 17

2. Alexander Jannaeus, 104–78 B.C.—Open rebellion probably led by Pharisees—Sadducees on the King's side 18

3. Alexandra Salome, 78–69 B.C.—Pharisees in power—Enact and teach traditional laws—Persecute their opponents 19

4. Political upheaval, 69–63 B.C.—Struggle between Hyrcanus II and his brother Aristobulus II, each supported by one of the two parties—Coming of the Romans—Pompey's sacrilege leads to Pharisees' hatred—Psalms of Solomon 19

5. Early Roman dominion, 63 B.C.–A.D. 6—Sadducees' adverse fortune under Herod the Great—Pharisees' comparative contentment—Their activity as codifiers and teachers of the Law—Hillel and Shammai—Apocalyptic development—Underlying resentment . . 20

6. Direct Roman rule from A.D. 6—Restoration of Sanhedrin—Sadducees leaders with few followers—Pharisees absorbed in the law—Sadducees adverse to rebellion—Also most Pharisees, yet some joined the Zealots—After A.D. 70, Sadducees disappear as a party—Pharisees victorious and become the nation 23

CHAPTER III

Names

1. *Pharisees.* Derivation—Meaning generally accepted 'the separated'—Schürer's view—Separated from things or persons?—Adherents of Schürer—Criticism of Leszynsky, Oesterley, Lauterbach and Box 26

(1) All Jews 'separated' 27

(2) Pharisees not separated from other Jews 27

(3) The name not specially suitable to express 'separated'—Alternative suggestion: 'interpreters'—Lauterbach's suggestion: separated from the King and Sanhedrin—Difficulties of these suggestions—Old interpretation not yet superseded . 27

PAGE

2. *Sadducees* 30
(1) Derivation by Fathers and some modern writers from צדק —Difficulty of 30
(2) From צדוק (Zadok)—Generally accepted—Which Zadok?—Zadok of Solomon's time—Confirmed by Ezekiel, Ecclesiasticus —Hölscher's view 31
(3) From Persian word 'Zindik'—Cowley's argument—Difficulties —Weight of evidence favours (2) 33

CHAPTER IV

Origin

Earlier investigations of Geiger, Wellhausen, and Schürer—Recent researches—Acute differences of view 35
Cleavage arose soon after the Exile on strictness and laxity—Nehemiah, Ezra, Book of Ruth—Influence of high-priests and their coterie—Opposed to the rigorists 36
Alexander's visit and Hellenistic influences—Large numbers yield—Continuous opposition of the strict legalists—Hasidim—Antiochus Epiphanes 38
Maccabean revolt—Its results—Legalists for the moment triumphant—Defection of the Maccabeans—Hellenizers wait and win . . 41
Lauterbach's theory 42
(1) At first priests alone in charge of Law—Interpretation and slight changes 42
(2) Religious anarchy from 270–190 B.C.—Demands of Laity . 43
(3) In 190 B.C. an authoritative Council ends the anarchy—Its difficulties *re* recent enactments—Influence of Laity . . 43
(4) Cleavage between priests and lay teachers resulting in latter authorizing Oral Law 44
(5) Oral Law established by Laity—Laity = Pharisees—Priests = Sadducees 44
Examination of this theory—Three tests applied. 45
(1) Were the Laity excluded before 270 B.C.? Evidence of Ezra, Chronicler, Sirach against 45
(2) Did a period of anarchy arise?—Greek influence unlikely to produce this—Absence of names explicable on other grounds—Moreover, dates of existing names uncertain 47
(3) Was the Council revived in 190 B.C.?—Letter of Antiochus no proof—Zadokite Fragment—Theory unproven and improbable 49

CHAPTER V

Principles and Development

I. Summary of different views 53
(1) Pharisees purely religious; Sadducees wholly political—Distinguished representatives of this view—Wellhausen: Pharisees the party of the Scribes; Sadducees the Jerusalem priests and aristocrats—Graetz and Schürer agree—Hölscher: Sadducees not a party at all—Segal supports this—Criticism: Sadducees known chiefly through opponents' literature—N.T., Josephus, and Mishnah against this view—Improbable that high-priestly party was irreligious 53
(2) Both parties religious—Sadducees conservative; Pharisees progressive—Supported by Krochmal and Geiger, Kohler, Cowley, Leszynsky, Lauterbach, Eerdmans also, in different ways—Zadokite Fragment favours it—Appears true on the whole 55
II. Constructive Statement. 56
(1) Pharisees—From Hasidim—Relation to Scribes—Devotion to the Law—Development of Oral Law—In what sense progressive—Leaders of the people, yet only a sect—How far non-political—Thoughts and feelings towards Sadducees—Book of Enoch,

PAGE

Psalms of Solomon—Relation to Apocalyptic movement—Laymen only?—Schools of Hillel and Shammai—Deep and genuine piety: Psalms of Solomon 56
(2) Sadducees—From Hellenizers, syncretists 65
(*a*) Strongly political 66
(*b*) High social position 66
(*c*) Frequent occupancy of the high-priesthood—Hölscher's opposition 67
(*d*) Conservatives in religion—Strongly opposed to Oral traditions—Lauterbach and their inconsistency—Segal's argument—Did not reject rest of Old Testament Books . . 68
(*e*) Real attitude to religion—Schürer, Cowley, Hölscher, Segal—Evidence of New Testament, Josephus, Mishnah, Zadokite Fragment in favour of genuineness of their religion . . 71

CHAPTER VI

Doctrines

Introductory. Aim—Scantiness of Sadducean literature—Developments in the last two pre-Christian centuries: legal and apocalyptic—Sadducees held aloof from both—Pharisaism progressive, Sadduceeism conservative—Development in the doctrine of God . . 75
I. Law and Tradition. Both sects held the Law but diverged on Tradition—Josephus and New Testament—Commanding position of Tradition and its vast development—Sadducees faithful to the Torah—Not against all Traditions, but kept the older Traditions in a Book of Decisions—Opposed to placing Tradition on equality with Torah as an obligation—Also, Tradition not obligatory like the Torah and must be deduced from it—What was the position of Jesus?—Leszynsky's argument that Jesus favoured the Sadducees' conclusion 78
II. Messianic hope. Common assumption that only the Pharisees had a doctrine of Messiah—Thus Schürer, Cowley, Mitchell, Eaton and Robertson—Leszynsky, Box and Oesterley against this—Leszynsky's argument: Messianic hope in David abandoned after Exile—Sadducees held to Levi—Certain Psalms—Exodus xix. 6—Pharisees' opposition—Opinions on this argument 83
(1) Waning of hope in Greek period 85
(2) Ascendancy of priest-princes and hope in Levi—Sirach, Psalm cx.—Testaments 85
(3) Return to hope in David—Editor of Testaments—Psalms of Solomon—Viteau 87
(4) Divided expectation: Pharisees and People, David; Sadducees, Levi—Zadokite Fragment 88
(5) Conclusion 88
III. Eschatology 89
New Testament—Josephus, Mishnah 89
Question really *re* Immortality—Old Testament: Job, Isaiah, Daniel 90
Ecclesiasticus 92
Ecclesiastes—Enoch—Jubilees 93
Testaments of Twelve Patriarchs 94
2 Maccabees 94
Psalms of Solomon 94
Zadokite Fragment 95
Effect of development on Pharisees—On Sadducees—Josephus unreliable 95
IV. Angels and Spirits. Acts—Schürer, Cowley, and others—Box, Oesterley and Leszynsky take a different view—Growth of ideas . 96
Old Testament: Ezekiel, Daniel—Non-canonical literature—Zoroastrian influence?—Effect on Pharisees—On Sadducees . 98

PAGE

V. Fate and Free-will. Josephus—Graetz, Schürer and others—Leszynsky and others 100
Old Testament evidence—Sirach—Enoch—Psalms of Solomon . 103
Zadokite Fragment—New Testament—Josephus again unreliable—Reason 104
Three suggestions 105

CHAPTER VII

Relations with Jesus and the Early Church

(A) the pharisees

Introductory. Jewish protests—Synoptic differences—Investigation to be welcomed 107
New Testament evidence—C. T. Dimont on the Synoptists—Value of his argument 108
I. Attitude of Pharisees to Jesus—Suspicion, criticism, antagonism . 111
Grounds for their antagonism 112
(1) His relations with publicans and sinners—the great contrast 113
(2) Attitude to Jewish Law 115
(*a*) In general, obedient to it 117
(*b*) In some matters severely critical, e.g. *re* the Sabbath, ritual ablutions 118
(3) His personal claims 124
(*a*) To forgive sins 125
(*b*) To possess peculiar authority 126
(*c*) To be the Messiah 128
(*d*) To stand in a special relation with God . . . 129
How this opposition was manifested: Delegations; controversies (*re* Sign, Beelzebub, Divorce, Tribute); seeking His death 131
II. Attitude of Jesus to Pharisees—Jesus as critic—Justified . . 134
(1) Antagonism inevitable in the nature of the case—Contrast of types 135
(2) His charges against them 137
(*a*) Excessive legalism and formalism 137
(*b*) Hypocrisy 138
(*c*) Wrong relation towards others, e.g. the masses, Baptist and Himself, society 141
(*d*) Danger of blasphemy against the Holy Spirit . . . 143
(3) Significance of this criticism 144
(*a*) Possible qualifications 145
(*b*) Was the reference to the Shammaites? 148
(*c*) Conclusion 149
III. The Early Church 151

CHAPTER VIII

Relations with Jesus and the Early Church

(B) the sadducees

Introductory. Rarely named in Gospels—Prominent in Acts—Hölscher's Theory of the double tradition—Simpler explanation of both facts . 153
I. Sadducees' relations with Jesus 155
(1) Appearance at John's baptism 155
(2) Their leaven—Jesus warns against 156
(3) Cleansing of Temple 157
(4) Question Jesus about His authority 158
(5) Parable of the Vineyard 159
(6) Question Jesus *re* Tribute 159
(7) Question Jesus *re* the Resurrection 160
(8) Bringing Jesus to death — (*a*) Conspiracy — (*b*) Judas Iscariot's help—(*c*) Arrest—(*d*) Examination before Caiaphas—(*e*) Before Pilate —(*f*) Mocking their Victim . . 161

PAGE

II. Relations with the Early Church 165
(1) Arrest of Peter and John 165
(2) Second arrest and trial before the Sanhedrin . . . 166
(3) Stephen's death—The great persecution 167
(4) Paul's trial before the Sanhedrin—Its sequel . . . 168
(5) Death of James, the Lord's brother 170
Conclusions 171

CHAPTER IX

General Estimate

Their history is too important to be dismissed summarily—Two questions may properly be asked: How the controversy was conducted; and what became of the principles in dispute? 173

I. As controversialists. Hellenism the provoking cause, but it only aroused a latent antagonism—Bitterness did at times find expression in vengeance—But each side took hard blows without wavering—Compensations came to both—To a certain extent each side attained its end 173

II. The fate of the principles in dispute.

(1) Of the Sadducees—Far from being merely negative—Stood by Old Testament as they had it—Friendliness with Hellenists a failure—Pharisees also influenced—Clung throughout to the Temple worship and sacrifices . . 175

(2) Of the Pharisees—Maintained Written and Oral Law—Not wholly responsible for absence of prophecy—Themselves the fruit of the legal spirit—But did little to retain or regain the Vision of God—Supreme in the Synagogue—Withdrawal from Temple a problem—The spirit produced by legalism—Notable developments in doctrine—Greatest contribution their unquenchable belief in God—Many virtues . . 176

Chapter I

IMPORTANCE OF THE PHARISEES AND SADDUCEES, AND SOURCES

Not much need be said to show the importance of these two parties in the history of Judaism and early Christianity. Their names have become symbols of opposing principles in religion, and if Pharisaism is the peculiar aversion of Christians, Sadduceeism is treated with like disfavour among Jews.

Jewish writers have for long shown a tendency to minimize the rôle of the Sadducees, and are disposed to complain that others do not follow their lead. But this would be to overlook the fact that, however unworthy this party may have been in itself, it did at the very least serve as a background and foil for the Pharisees. Without the Sadducees it would be difficult, if not impossible, to explain the origin and struggles of their opponents. On the other hand, adequate appreciation of the Pharisees by Jewish writers has never been wanting. The great service this party rendered in maintaining and moulding the faith of their Fathers, in times of supreme difficulty, has been deservedly and abundantly recognized by their compatriots. Thus K. Kohler affirms that Pharisaism shaped the character of Judaism and the life and thought of the Jew for all the future.[1] I. Abrahams goes even further: 'Pharisaism was not a mere historical phase; it has remained a vital force; it has gone on without a moment's break from the centuries before the Christian era to the twentieth century of that era. It has been put to the test of time and of life. It has survived throughout an experience such as no other religious system has undergone.'[2] Nor have non-Jewish writers been slow to acknowledge its importance in the history of the Jewish faith. R. Travers Herford, a most sympathetic student and defender of the Jewish religion, regards Pharisaism as the epitome of

[1] Kohler, art. 'Pharisees,' *J. E.* ix., p. 666.

[2] Abrahams, *Studies in Pharisaism and the Gospels*, vi. f.

Judaism: 'The Pharisees remained, as representing all that was left alive of Judaism!'[1]

To the student of the New Testament some knowledge of these two parties is essential. Taken together, they form a large part of the human conditions and background of the ministry of Jesus. During His lifetime the Temple-circle was composed very largely, if not exclusively, of Sadducees, who were responsible for the entire administration of public worship and sacrifices. Whether popular or not, they were undoubtedly the official representatives of the Jewish religion. Towards the end of His life they became Christ's determined opponents and finally brought Him to death. Their attitude to the early Church was almost a replica of this—restrained at first; later, when they saw the danger, bitterly antagonistic.

The Pharisees, with their scribes, were the popular teachers of religion in the many synagogues which by this time covered the whole land. They prepared the soil into which the Christian seed was cast. And when Jesus began His work of public instruction, the people naturally instituted a comparison between the spirit and methods of His teaching and those of their usual scribal instructors.[2] To discern the form and colour of Christ's life, to understand the special type and character of His teaching, the difficulties and contentions in which He was necessarily involved, what it meant to attempt the transformation of a nation's religious conceptions, one requires an intimate acquaintance with these opposing parties and their long and chequered history. However necessary it may have been for the followers of Jesus, at a later stage, to elaborate into a system the teaching of their Master, He Himself was no philosophic enunciator of abstract truths, but a very wise and considerate teacher of ordinary folk, shaping His message to meet the immediate needs of the occasion and the difficulties of those whom He encountered. And this very lack of system, while making His words of more direct worth to His contemporaries, imposes on later generations the obligation of understanding, as much as may be, the prepossessions and outlook of the men of that time. If the Great Teacher supplied the material, His hearers were responsible for the mould in

[1] Herford, *Pharisaism*, p. 45.

[2] Mark i. 22, and par.

which it was placed. Without understanding them it is almost impossible to understand Him.

Nor was it only during the lifetime of the Founder of Christianity that Pharisaism made its presence felt, as the reader of the Acts of the Apostles is well aware. A few members of the Party apparently became Christians, but the vast majority saw in the Apostolic teaching a renewed attack on the Law and were quick to repel it. Even those who became Christians stood by their legalistic views of religion. And the keen struggle at Antioch for Gentile freedom from Jewish restrictions, and the persistent opposition of the Judaizers to Paul's teaching on this subject, bear witness to the depth and pertinacity of Pharisaic influence.

Happily the *sources* of information respecting the two parties, though leaving something to be desired here and there, are sufficient to enable us to reach conclusions on most points of their history.

I. JOSEPHUS is one of the most valuable of these sources. The works of this writer[1] which concern us are as follows:

(*a*) *The Jewish War*, written about A.D. 75–79.

(*b*) *Jewish Antiquities*, date about A.D. 93–94.

(*c*) *Life* (*of Josephus*), date about A.D. 93–94.

Though a Jew, Josephus wrote for Greek and Roman readers, and with the evident desire to make the history and beliefs of his own nation acceptable to them. And in pursuit of this aim he was neither unbiased nor over strict in his adherence to exact truth. As Niese says: 'Truth is sacrificed to tendency, for though he asserts that he will set down nothing but the truth, and the whole truth (*A. J.* x. 218, xiv. 1), he does not keep his promise. He omits and he adds; he very frequently quotes from his authorities in very casual fashion.'[2] Turning to his account of the Jewish sects, we find him yielding to the temptation to establish a parallel between them and the philosophical schools known to his readers, and it is easy to see that this has had an unfortunate effect on his historical accuracy. There is also good reason to suppose that we are not in possession of all the information which he intended to supply concerning their tenets. In the *Antiquities* he tells us

[1] *Vide* art. on 'Josephus,' by B. Niese in *E. R. E.*, vol. vii. [2] Ibid., p. 576.

that he has already written a fuller and more exact account of them in the *War*. But on turning to the passage referred to, one finds nothing fuller than what appears in the later work.[1] The additional information seems to have been accidentally or purposely omitted by later editors. Whether our loss is small or great we have no means of knowing, but it is unfortunate. As an historian it cannot be said that Josephus exhibits any unusual gift of insight or any special diligence in research, but as he is for certain periods our best, sometimes our only, informant, he is, if used with care, a valuable and welcome source. But he was both Priest and Pharisee, and, throughout, seeks the favourable verdict of his readers.

II. Apocryphal and Pseudepigraphical Literature.—This is important in a very high degree, even though some of it may have been rewritten or edited by members of the surviving and victorious Pharisaic party. The most valuable books for our present purpose are the following:

(*a*) *Ecclesiasticus* (or *Sirach*), to be dated about 180 B.C. Though it belongs to the period just before our two parties arose, it probably represents that section of the community which became Sadducean, and on account of the scantiness of genuine Sadducean literature is of great service.

(*b*) 1 *Maccabees*, date about 100–80 B.C., gives the best extant account of the Maccabean struggle for religion and freedom. From its favourable treatment of the Priesthood and Temple it seems best to assign it to a Sadducean writer.

(*c*) *The Zadokite Fragment*, dated by Canon Charles between 18 and 8 B.C., recently discovered by Schechter in the Genizah at Cairo and published in 1910. It is a 'find' of extraordinary interest and importance for one of our two parties. Obviously anti-Pharisaic, it seems to represent some off-shoot or branch of Sadducees. Not only is it welcome because of the light it throws on later Sadducean developments, but because it reveals Sadduceeism as a living force.

The above are the only remnants of this literature which can be said to spring from Sadducean sources. Whether this paucity is due to their own lack of literary activity, or to wilful destruction by their opponents, remains in doubt. The remainder originated among the Pharisees, though it must not be assumed that they were responsible for it as a party. It

[1] Cf. *Ant.* xiii. v. 9 and xviii. i. 2 with *War*, ii. viii. 14.

was the work of individuals. The following throw light on our two parties:

(*d*) 1 *Enoch*, a collection of Apocalyptic writings composed at different times during the two last pre-Christian centuries and of Pharisaic origin.

(*e*) *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*, written between 109 and 106 B.C. (according to Charles), when the Maccabees were in high favour with the Pharisees. Later, probably about 70–40 B.C. and when this dynasty had degenerated, additions were made which give an entirely different and unfavourable view of these priest-kings. Both the original and the revision came from Pharisaic hands.

(*f*) *The Psalms of Solomon*, date between 63 and 48 B.C., are the work of various authors who were undoubtedly Pharisees.

(*g*) 2 *Maccabees*, dated by Charles between 60 and 1 B.C., covers part of the same period as 1 Maccabees, but from a different and Pharisaic standpoint.

III. The New Testament.—Despite all that has been alleged by Jewish and other writers against the New Testament because of its supposed bias and unfairness, to which reference is made at a later stage, we have seen no argument which effectively challenges its character as a first-class source.

(*a*) *The Synoptic Gospels* are of prime importance as a record of the struggle between the two parties and Jesus. The student should, of course, bear in mind the relative value of the evidence they afford; modern investigation into the sources (both Marcan and Q) from which the writers have drawn, cannot be ignored, and, when properly used, is of great assistance towards attaining a balanced judgement. It should also be remembered that the writers make no attempt at a judicial estimate of the merits of our two parties as a whole, but their incidental allusions are probably even more valuable on that account.

(*b*) *The Acts of the Apostles* is now being submitted to fresh examination by Loisy, Foakes Jackson, Kirsopp Lake, Goguel, and others. It would be unwise to forecast the result, but, as yet, there appears little likelihood that the testimony of the Acts to the relations between the Pharisees and Sadducees and the early Church will be seriously affected.

IV. Rabbinical Literature.—Of chief value to us are the

following: the *Mishnah*, which cannot be dated earlier than the second half of the second century (A.D.) and the *Tosephtah*, whose date is still later. Though interesting, especially to Jewish readers, this literature cannot be regarded as a first-class witness. Not only is its date late, but it is impossible to decide to what extent the earlier oral teaching, on which it is based, was modified by the development of events, such as, for instance, the loss of the Temple and the struggle with Christianity. Oesterley's opinion may be recorded, all the more because it maintains a different view. He claims that it is 'in the highest degree improbable that these accounts should be fictitious, for by the time that they were incorporated in the Mishnah the Pharisees had long triumphed over the Sadducees; there would therefore have been no point in making them up.'[1] But deliberate concoction is only one, and not the most misleading, form of historical unreliability.

[1] *Books of the Apoc.*, p. 137.

Chapter II

OUTLINE OF THEIR HISTORY

I. The First Appearance of the Pharisees and Sadducees as *distinct parties* occurs in the second half of the second century B.C. Josephus does indeed give a brief characterization of their general opinions in an earlier passage,[1] but adds nothing to our knowledge of their history. The first recorded incident occurred during the reign of John Hyrcanus (135–105 B.C.), and it is quite evident that by that time both parties were full-grown. The story told by Josephus is to the effect that this prince, who was then a disciple of the Pharisees 'and greatly beloved by them,' invited his co-religionists to a banquet, and, when they had reached the stage of good humour, told them of his desire to live righteously and acceptably before God, adding a request that they would tell him of any fault which they detected in him so that he might correct it. All but one 'testified to his being entirely virtuous.' But Eleazar, the exception, bluntly demanded that he should lay down the office of high-priest and content himself with his position as prince. And when Hyrcanus asked for his reason, Eleazar stated the common suspicion that his Jewish descent was not pure owing to his mother having once been a captive. 'This story was false, and Hyrcanus was very angry with him, and all the Pharisees were very indignant. Now there was a certain Jonathan, a very great friend of Hyrcanus, but of the sect of the Sadducees,' near by, and he thought the opportunity to advance the interests of his own party too good to lose. Insinuating that Eleazar did not stand alone, but represented the real sentiments of the Pharisees as a whole, he suggested that the prince could easily test their loyalty by inviting them to prescribe suitable punishment for their comrade. When, then, they proposed nothing worse than 'stripes and bonds,'

[1] *Ant.* xiii. v. 9.

Hyrcanus became thoroughly angry, and in exasperation forsook the Pharisaic party altogether and joined the Sadducees. He also abolished 'the decrees they had imposed on the people and' punished 'those that observed them.' Josephus here explains that 'the Pharisees have delivered to the people a great many traditional observances handed down from their fathers, which are not written in the laws of Moses, and for that reason it is that the Sadducees reject them.'[1]

The story is of great value, even if not to be relied on in all its details.[2] Its general outlines are entirely in accord with later information. The differing attitudes of the parties towards 'Law' and 'Tradition,' the Pharisees' objection to the civil ruler being also high-priest, and their opposition to the Hasmoneans on this account—these elements of the story are certainly well founded. It is also manifest that the parties burst upon the scene in an advanced stage of development, far beyond mere tendency, though Josephus has nowhere told us of their origin.

II. The Reign of Alexander Jannaeus (104–78 B.C.) shows how far and fast the rupture had gone. Open rebellion broke out between ruler and people, and continued for six years. Josephus does not definitely specify the cause, but that this was at least partly religious is sufficiently attested by the action of the multitude in using Eleazar's accusation to insult Alexander. Moreover, two statements of Josephus tend to show that the people were supported, if not led by, the Pharisees: first, when Alexander lay at the point of death he recommended his wife and successor to 'put some authority into the hands of the Pharisees for they would . . . reconcile the nation to her . . . and he said that it was owing to them, whom indeed he had insulted, that he had incurred the displeasure of the nation'; and secondly, when the Pharisees came into the queen's favour, they sought vengeance on those who had abetted the late king in his murderous conduct.[3]

It seems equally probable, that, while the Pharisees were thus opposing the Ruler, the Sadducees were his counsellors and friends. As Cowley remarks, the war 'may be regarded as a

[1] *Ant.* XIII. X. 5–6.

[2] Some would follow the Talmud and place the incident in the time of Alexander Jannaeus (104–78 B.C.).

[3] *Ant.* XIII. XV. 5; XVI. 2.

contest between the Pharisaic and the Sadducean parties';[1] and Guthe similarly says that it was largely 'his strained relations with the Pharisees' which 'deprived Alexander of the favour of the people.'[2]

III. Under Queen Alexandra Salome (78–69 B.C.) the position of the two parties in the nation was exactly reversed. Whether because of the late king's advice, or from sympathy or fear, the queen gave the Pharisees an important share in the internal government of the nation. 'She had indeed the name of queen, but the Pharisees had all the authority; for it was they who restored such as had been banished, and set such as were prisoners at liberty; in a word, they differed in nothing from lords of the realm.' Alexandra also 'ordered the multitude to be obedient to them' and 'restored those practices which the Pharisees had introduced, according to the traditions of their forefathers, and which her father-in-law Hyrcanus had abrogated.'[3] Later Jewish writers always regard this reign as marking the summit of Pharisaic glory and divine favour. 'Under Simon ben Shetach and Queen Salome rain fell on the eve of the Sabbath, so that the corns of wheat were large as kidneys, the barley-corns as large as olives, and the lentils like golden denarii; the scribes gathered such corns and preserved specimens of them in order to show future generations what sin entails.'[4] Yet the Pharisees regarded political power as of quite secondary importance. Now, as throughout their entire history, they sought to instil their principles and doctrines into the minds of the people, and with such striking success that the masses became devoted to them. They also had their way in the contention that the high-priesthood should not be held by a civil Ruler, and Alexandra's elder son, Hyrcanus II, was appointed to this office, though he soon proved himself to be a pliable weakling. It is to the lasting discredit of the Pharisees, however, that they abused this temporary lease of power to persecute their rivals, the Sadducees, a lapse which produced an abundant harvest of vengeance under the leadership of Alexandra's second son, once the queen was dead.

IV. From 69–63 B.C. was a time of great political turmoil in which both parties were involved, and from which little

[1] *E.B.*, 4237. [2] *E.B.*, 2266 f. [3] *Ant.* xiii. xvi. 2.
[4] *Tal. Bab-Taanith*, 23 *a*, quoted by Derenbourg, 'Essai,' &c., p. 111.

credit accrued to the reputation of either. First a struggle took place between the high-priest, Hyrcanus II, and his brother, Aristobulus II, for exclusive possession of both throne and high-priesthood, with the result that the latter, being a man of more active and forceful temperament, quickly triumphed over his phlegmatic brother. Probably Hyrcanus would have been content to live the life of a private individual, but the Idumaean Antipater stirred him up to resistance with promises of foreign aid, and the nation was again plunged into civil war. Graetz conjectures that Aristobulus was supported by the Sadducees and Hyrcanus by the Pharisees, who were upheld by the people. This is probably true, but in the end Aristobulus won the day and absorbed in his own person both the sovereignty and the high-priesthood.[1] In 65 B.C. the Romans intervened, and ambassadors from the rival brothers hastened to Scaurus, the Roman general, to obtain his favour. Two years later Pompey arrived, and a third embassy joined the other two, this last representing the people themselves. Weary of the plight into which the land had been thrown by the bitter struggle, they besought the Roman to give them back their old form of government under 'the priests of that God whom they worshipped.'[2] Shortly afterwards Pompey made what was, from a Roman standpoint, a terrible mistake, and from a Jewish point of view an unforgivable sin. Having taken Jerusalem after a three months' siege, he so far departed from the usual prudence of his nation as to enter into the 'Holy of Holies.' Nothing that either he or his nation could do afterwards, by way of concession or clemency, ever availed to wipe out the stain of this unthinkable desecration. The Pharisees expressed their detestation of Pompey in the so-called Psalms of Solomon,[3] and regarded the whole incident as a punishment imposed upon them by God on account of the vileness of the Sadducean aristocracy and priesthood.[4] But the Sadducees themselves did not go unpunished, as the Jewish leaders, whom Pompey executed because of their prolonged resistance, belonged in all likelihood to their party.

V. EARLY ROMAN DOMINION, 63 B.C.–A.D. 6.—Though the Romans now assumed the overlordship of Palestine, these new masters were just then at cross purposes among themselves,

[1] *Ant.* XIV. i. 2; XV. iii. 1.
[2] Especially Ps. Sol. i., ii., viii. and xvii.
[3] *Ant.* XIV. iii. 2.
[4] Ps. Sol. viii. 12–19.

and the bewildering confusion at the centre found expression at this new outpost of Empire. First the Sadducees came into favour and then the Pharisees, and then the process was repeated, until in the end Herod (called the Great) took charge of affairs in the name of the Romans and became primus in everything, whether of Church or State. Whom he would he appointed high-priest, and whom he would he deposed.

To the Sadducees, whose interests were both political and ecclesiastical, these vicissitudes were a bitter experience. The Sanhedrin, the chief Jewish court, in which they had long been a potent force, steadily lost importance, until under Herod it practically disappeared. And when that monarch proceeded to appoint and depose high-priests merely for political or personal reasons and without regard to true priestly descent, their cup of bitterness was full. Probably Herod's Hellenizing practices did not greatly trouble them, any more than would his political obsequiousness to Rome, but his cruel and determined suppression of their party led them to regard this Idumaean interloper with implacable hostility. From the day when on ascending the throne he summarily executed forty-five of their number, to the day of his death, he made it evident that the Sadducees' spell of power had for the time reached its end.

With the Pharisees it was otherwise. Unlike their rivals, so long as they were permitted to continue their religious pursuits unhindered, they were not interested in politics as such. Consequently it mattered little to them whether it was Hyrcanus II or Antipater, Antigonos or Herod who was at the head of affairs. No doubt they resented the cynicism of Herod's high-priestly appointments, but even this was tempered by his abstention from assuming the august position himself. In one matter, too, the king treated them with indulgence. While the rest of the nation quietly accepted the Roman suzerainty and took the oath of allegiance, the Pharisees, though offering no active opposition, refused the oath, and to their astonishment were let off with a fine.[1] But Herod was nothing if not astute, and knowing well how enormous was their influence over the multitude, whom they held in the hollow of their hand, he doubtless deemed it prudent to treat this dereliction as a minor offence. Thus an attitude of mutual toleration was maintained till near the end of his reign. The

[1] *Ant.* XVII. ii. 4.

Pharisees, on their part, driven in upon themselves, lived after their manner in comparative tranquillity, cultivating the hope that God would in His own time and manner deliver them from the semi-foreign tyrant, and inculcating the same spirit among the people. Then, again, they had their Law, and to this they devoted themselves with increasing zest. The Scribes, who became so conspicuous at this time, found in the abstention of the Pharisees from the political turmoil of the day a favourable opportunity for the development of their arduous work. Masses of tradition had been accumulating since the days of Ezra, and these were now discussed in the schools, reduced to system and order, and taught diligently to the people. The two outstanding Pharisaic leaders were Hillel and Shammai, representing two different types of thought, the one milder, the other more severe, and between them they divided the party into sharply opposed sections.

But great as was the Pharisees' preoccupation with the Law, the growing 'Apocalyptic' movement among the people must have claimed some share of their attention. From the early years of the second century, the hopes of the faithful had found expression in various Apocalyptic Writings, many of which are still extant. Such were the Books of Daniel, Enoch, and the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs, and to these was now added the Assumption of Moses. How far the Pharisees as a party were responsible for this movement is perhaps uncertain, but undoubtedly many of their number heartily sympathized with it, and individual Pharisees became contributors to its literature.

Absorbed in such fruitful activities, the Pharisees could afford to allow political events to run their course. But they watched the Government with a critical eye and eagerly anticipated its downfall. 'God had decreed that Herod's sway should cease, and that his posterity should be deprived of it,' so they foretold.[1] And when Herod's last and fatal illness came upon him, signs of incipient Zealotism broke out even among these unworldly Legalists. Under the inspiration and guidance of two of the 'most celebrated interpreters of the Jewish laws,' a determined and successful attempt was made to pull down the large golden eagle which the king had placed over the great gate of the Temple. The perpetrators of this

[1] *Ant.* XVII. ii. 4.

bold deed paid the usual penalty of death, but the incident is significant as showing the presence of the hot fires of indignation hidden beneath the calm surface of these men's lives.

VI. Under Direct Roman Rule, from A.D. 6.—After a brief and turbulent reign of ten years, Herod's son, Archelaus, was deposed, and the Roman Government took direct control of affairs. Faithful to their traditional method of governing subject races, the Romans at once placed the internal government almost entirely in the hands of the Jews themselves. One important result of this clemency was the revival of the suppressed Sanhedrin, and with it the return of the Sadducees to power. For, though the Pharisees had not been without some representation in this supreme Jewish court since the reign of Alexandra, the preponderating influence had rested with the Sadducees, and, apart from Herod's freak appointments, the presidency had usually been in their hands.[1] After so lengthy a sojourn in the wilderness the resumption of the old authority must have been peculiarly congenial to them. But in the interval circumstances had greatly changed, and they now found themselves leaders indeed, but with only a handful of followers. The mention by Josephus of their reluctance to take office is probably explicable by the fact that they were now obliged to 'addict themselves to the notions of the Pharisees, because the people would not otherwise put up with them.'[2] The Pharisees, on the other hand, rejoicing in their liberty to worship as they would, in their elaboration of the traditional law and in their growing influence over the people, found in these things more than adequate compensation for their comparative impotence in the revived Sanhedrin.

The unfavourable light in which both Pharisees and Sadducees are represented in the Gospel narratives has led to much contention, but as this subject will be dealt with in some detail in later chapters,[3] we may content ourselves here with a brief remark. It is not necessary to assume that the criticisms and denunciations by Jesus of Pharisaic narrowness and excessive legalism, and of Sadducean superficiality, refer to the whole body of Pharisees and Sadducees. Nor should it be forgotten that, later on, the Pharisees, at any rate, passed through purifying fires of calamity which removed much of

[1] *Ant.* xx. ix. 1; Acts v. 17. Hölscher argues against this view in *Der Sadduzäismus*.
[2] *Ant.* xviii. i. 4. [3] Chaps. vii. and viii.

the dross from that fine gold that was never wholly lacking in many of their number. Still, nothing can alter the fact that the Pharisees were the frequent and bitter critics of the Founder of Christianity, and that the Sadducees brought him to death.

It is not easy to disentangle the actions of the two parties in the events which led up to the Great Rebellion of A.D. 66–70. Probably, as parties, their share in the troubles which menaced and ultimately destroyed the nation was limited to the exercise of restraint. As for the Sadducees, they appear to have held aloof from the revolutionaries from the outset. They valued too highly their exalted position under the Romans to jeopardize it by a mad attempt to secure independence, and, being also much better acquainted than the rest of their countrymen with the vast resources of Roman power, recognized from the beginning the hopelessness of any effort to shake it off. Probably the majority of the Pharisees adopted the same attitude, though for different reasons. So long as they were left unmolested in the practice of their religion, they were disinclined to resort to physical force to achieve what God would in His own good time bestow upon them freely. But the perversity and cruelty of successive Procurators sorely tried both faith and patience, and in the end the maladministration of these Roman representatives stung some of them to a fanatical madness which nothing could control. The Zealot Movement was inspired by patriotism and religion, and the latter was that taught and practised by Scribes, Apocalyptists, and Pharisees. Whether, therefore, they were conscious of it or not, the Pharisees had a certain share of responsibility for the insurrection. And when it actually came, like a flood bearing away everything in its course, many of the younger Pharisees openly joined the movement.

After the catastrophe of A.D. 70 had passed, and Jerusalem with its Temple remained only a name and a memory, the Sadducees as a party disappeared entirely from Jewish life. The Temple having gone, they lost their *raison d'être*. So complete was their submergence, that soon even Jewish scholars seemed hardly conscious that such a section of the community had ever existed—a fact which explains many confusing errors in later generations. On the Pharisees the downfall of City and Temple had a different effect. The

Sanhedrin had certainly come to an end, but a body of Rabbis quickly took its place. They met first at Jamnia (Jabne), and there and at Tiberias famous scribes—now at length all Pharisees—Johanan ben Sakkai, Gamaliel II, Joshua, Eliezer, Akiba, and others, resumed their interrupted labours. At their head was a President, whose power steadily grew until he was recognized by the Romans as the representative of all Palestinian Jews. No longer a party, contending against opposing elements, but including in their ranks the whole nation, Christian Jews alone excepted, they continued to develop and codify their sacred laws and teach them to the people. Pharisees as such had ceased to exist—they were simply Jews.

Chapter III

NAMES: PHARISEES AND SADDUCEES

I. Pharisees.—The name 'Pharisees' comes from the Aramaic פרישין (Perishin), (stat: emphat: פרישיא) and this from the Hebrew פרושים (Perushim). The Greek transliteration is φαρισαῖοι (Pharisaioi), hence our English word Pharisees.

It is generally supposed that, however uncertain may be the origin and meaning of the term 'Sadducees,' the name 'Pharisees' means 'the separated ones,' and that this signification is beyond controversy. Unfortunately this is far from being the case, though undoubtedly the majority of writers are of this opinion.

Schürer, on whom the modern view largely rests, is quite emphatic: 'That this (name) literally means "the separated" is undoubted. The only question can be, to what to refer the term. Are they those who separate themselves from *all uncleanness* and all illegality, or those who separate themselves from certain *persons*?'[1] If it is intended to include 'persons' as well as 'things,' the reference would seem to go back to the times of Zerubbabel and Ezra, who commanded the Jews to separate themselves from the people of the land and from their uncleanness. But, as has been pointed out by Wellhausen, such separation was no peculiarity of the Pharisees, but common to the majority of the people. The separation referred to must, therefore, have been 'not only from the uncleanness of the heathen, but also from that with which, according to their view, a great portion of the people were affected.' This view was maintained, with variations, by the Fathers and Rabbis.[2] The majority of modern writers, such as Fairweather,[3] Eaton,[4] J. D. Prince,[5] and Kohler,[6] express with

[1] *J. P. T. J. C.*, II. ii. 19. [2] Ibid., p. 20 and note. [3] *Background of the Gospels.*
[4] 'Pharisees,' *H. D. B.* [5] 'Scribes and Pharisees,' *E. B.* Pharisees,' *J. E*

but little discussion their adhesion to Schürer. Niven,[1] though calling attention to Oesterley's argument in favour of another interpretation, himself decides for the common explanation. A. T. Robertson, in a recent volume entitled *The Pharisees and Jesus*, refers in a note to Leszynsky's view, to which Oesterley has given adhesion, but remains himself unconvinced.[2]

There can be little doubt that the idea of 'separation' when applied to the Pharisees is open to serious criticism, as has been shown by the observations of Leszynsky, Oesterley, Lauterbach, and Box, even though the true interpretation is not easy to reach. This criticism may be summarized as follows:

1. Separation from both persons and things, regarded as unclean, was, to a greater or less degree, a characteristic of Judaism as a whole from the time of Ezra. It seems hardly probable, therefore, either that one section of the people would assume for themselves such a virtue as their distinguishing mark, or that the rest of the people would tacitly condemn themselves by applying it to them.

2. No evidence or statement can be found in Josephus to show that the Pharisees did, in fact, separate themselves from the rest of the people to any important degree. They mixed with the ordinary people as their instructors, ultimately became their chosen leaders, and their influence over them was so great that even Herod the Great was obliged to treat the party with the greatest circumspection. There is, in fact, much more reason for accusing their opponents, the Sadducees, of the practice of separation.

3. Oesterley argues that if the common view refer to separation from unholy things rather than 'persons,' a better word than one derived from פרש might have been employed, and suggests one derived from קדש, which would signify not 'separation' but 'holiness.'

Thus far these writers agree, but when an alternative explanation is sought they split into two sections.

Leszynsky and Oesterley refer to another meaning of the root (פרש) from which Perushim (Pharisees) comes, signifying 'to make distinct, declare.'[3] Having already alluded to the

[1] 'Pharisees,' *D. A. C.*

[2] *Pharisees and Jesus*, p. 20, n.

[3] So *B. D. B.*, Heb. Lex; later forms are not different, thus N.H. to separate oneself, Pi. separate, explain; also Aram פרש esp. Pa; Syr. ܦܪܫ = separate, distinguish, explain. A passage is quoted from Lev. xxiv. 12, where the sense is 'to declare distinctly to them.'

difficulties in the way of accepting 'separatists' as the true meaning, Oesterley proceeds with his argument in favour of 'interpreters' (i.e. of the Law). Josephus is quoted, who says: 'The Pharisees are esteemed most skilful in the exact interpretation of their laws.'[1] He next points to the fact that in Rabbinical literature the same sense of 'explaining, expounding, interpreting,' is common, and concludes: 'All the evidence goes to show that as used in connexion with the name Pharisee the root has the sense of to "interpret" or "expound."'[2] Against this argument must be set the fact that the word Perushim is a passive participle, a form which does not readily lend itself to the active sense of 'interpreters.'[3]

The interpretation which best commends itself to Lauterbach and Box appears first in a foot-note to a most suggestive article by the former in a volume of 'Studies in Jewish Literature.'[4] Lauterbach believes that the Pharisees were first spoken of as 'the wise men of Israel' (חכמי ישראל) or simply 'the wise' (חכמים) to distinguish them from 'the wise men of (the) priests' (חכמי כהנים) or 'Sadducees' (צדוקים). Arguing from a scholion to the Mishnaic Tractate 'Taanith,' he claims that 'the wise men' (חכמים) were 'lay teachers of Israelitic, non-priestly descent.' Turning then to the report of the conflict between the Pharisees and John Hyrcanus[5] as it is given in the Tractate 'Kiddushin,' where the term for the Pharisees is 'wise men of Israel' (חכמי ישראל), he points to the fact that their Sadducean traducer speaks of them as Perushim (פרושים) and accuses them of being opposed to the King (לבם של פרושים עליך). If this report can be trusted, the name Pharisees is given by their Sadducean enemy and implies 'disloyalty' or 'separation in heart from the king.' Lauterbach then quotes another phrase from the same source which means 'and the Israelite teachers were dismissed' or perhaps 'expelled from the Sanhedrin,' so suggesting the idea of 'exclusion.' Thus the wise teachers were called 'the excluded or expelled ones' (נבדלים) or 'Perushim' (פרושים), i.e. Pharisees. The name clung to the party and was in course

[1] *War*, II. viii. 14. With this may be compared Neh. viii. 8; 'And they read in the book of the law distinctly' (R.V. marg., 'with an interpretation'). The LXX, though working from a different text, does not depart from this meaning.

[2] *Bks. Apoc.*, pp. 131 ff.

[3] Cf. Box, 'Pharisees,' *E. R. E.*

[4] p. 195, n.

[5] *Vide* chap. ii. above.

of time accepted by them, but with a new interpretation: not 'expelled' from the Sanhedrin, but signifying that they 'separated themselves' from the wicked Sadducees, with whom they declined to sit in that assemblage. Box in his article on the Pharisees in *E. R. E.*, though stating that the explanation of the name is a difficult and unsolved problem, evidently regards this suggestion as one of considerable probability.

We thus have three possible interpretations of the name Pharisees: (1) the usual one, viz. 'the separatists,' that is, from people or things, or both; (2) 'interpreters,' that is, of the Law; and (3) 'Seceders' or 'expelled' from the Sanhedrin. None is free from difficulty; each may be plausibly maintained. Taking first the last theory (3), advanced with great ability by Lauterbach, it is to be noted that such strength as it possesses turns on the historicity of an incident of the time of John Hyrcanus which is not usually regarded as reliable in its details. Neither the account of Josephus nor that of the Mishnaic tract is above suspicion. In addition, the idea that the Pharisees were 'seceders' from the Sanhedrin is at most only partially true. During the reign of Alexandra Salome (78–69 B.C.) they were supreme in that powerful assembly, and later on were represented there to some extent at any rate, whereas during the long reign of Herod the Great the Sanhedrin itself was practically non-existent. This explanation of the name could only have had reference therefore to a certain definite occasion, the account of which is of speculative reliability, and which had probably been forgotten by almost every one. The appropriateness of a name with such a signification is consequently extremely doubtful.

The difficulty in accepting the theory upheld by Leszynsky and Oesterley (2) is found not only in that mentioned above (*re* the passive participle) but even more in the fact that the work of 'interpreters' was mainly, if not exclusively, undertaken by the Scribes. Now many, perhaps most, Scribes were Pharisees, but not all Pharisees were Scribes. To interpret the Law required great learning, and this was the special qualification of the Scribes for their task. The average Pharisee was not in a position to undertake this work, which required long years of preparation. His was much less the work of interpretation than that of diligent, scrupulous practice of the holy law.

These objections do not prove that the old theory (1) is entirely satisfactory, though reconsideration may show that the objections urged against it are not as conclusive as might appear at first. It is quite possible to show that the Pharisees were not in the more obvious sense 'separatists,' but it can hardly be denied that though they went to and fro among the ordinary people, they were not of them, and indeed regarded the bulk with a measure of contempt.[1] They certainly became their instructors and at last their leaders, but all the time lived a life on a higher (legal) level, and for this very reason received the admiration of those who followed them at a distance with laggard and halting steps. Besides, the name the Pharisees chose for themselves, 'Haberim' (חברים), meaning 'colleagues' or 'fellow-members,' indicated membership of a community which separated itself from the rest of the people, whom they called in derision 'Am-Ha-Aretz' (עם־הארץ), i.e. the People of the Land. Their association with the people was merely of a missionary or propagandist character, and there was no mingling of the two in the ordinary sense.

On the whole, then, while fully recognizing the difficulties of the common meaning attached to the name 'Pharisees,' one finds it difficult to see in any recent suggestions a more satisfactory explanation of the admitted facts.

II. The Name 'Sadducees.' Heb. צדוקים (Zaddukim), Gr. Σαδδουκαῖοι (hence English 'Sadducees').

If the meaning of the name 'Pharisees' has come to be regarded as uncertain, the origin of the name of their opponents has always been in doubt.

1. Many of the Fathers, e.g. Epiphanius[2] and Jerome,[3] and a few modern writers, e.g. Derenbourg,[4] Hamburger,[5] and Edersheim[6] derive the name from the Hebrew adjective צדיק (Zaddik), a word which means 'righteous,' and presumably signifies, as applied to the Sadducees, devotion to the 'written law,' or perhaps their 'righteousness' or 'severity' as judges. But the objections to such a derivation are insuperable. First there is a grammatical difficulty: the plural

[1] Cf. John vii. 49. [2] *Haer.*, 14. [3] *Com.*, Matt. xxii. 23. [4] *Hist. de la Palest.*, p. 78.
[5] *Real—Encyc.*, p. 1041. [6] *Life and Times of Jesus Christ*, i. 323 f.

of צדיק (Zaddik) is צדיקים (Zaddikim) not צדוקים (Zaddukim) and the change from the vowel *i* to *u* cannot be accounted for.[1] Further, the special characteristic of 'righteousness,' which this alleged origin would ascribe to the Sadducees, has no justification in history. They themselves never claimed to be particularly righteous, history gives no evidence of it, and their opponents never attributed it to them.[2]

2. Abandoning this theory, therefore, we come next to a derivation which is now almost universally accepted, viz. that from צדוק (Zadok). But which of the many Zadoks is intended is not at first easy to decide.

(*a*) According to Aboth de Rabbi Nathan (chap. v), a document which belongs in all probability to the ninth century of our era, the Zadok who was the father of the Sadducees was a disciple of Antigonos of Socho, who is famous for having taught his disciples to serve God without expectation of reward, an exhortation which is interpreted to signify a denial of the future life.[3] This theory was adopted by Ewald, but it will be seen that the compilation in which it first finds expression is of too recent a date to give it much historical value. Further, the whole passage contains historical inaccuracies which entirely vitiate its testimony. The origin of the Boethusians is made contemporary with that of the Sadducees, whereas it was not earlier than the reign of Herod the Great. It is further incorrect in making the denial of the doctrine of Immortality the fundamental principle of Sadduceeism, for, even if this did form one of the tenets of the party, there is no justification for the supposition that it was this difference which brought it into being.

(*b*) Kuenen[4] and Montet prefer to postulate an unknown Zadok, 'perhaps,' says the former, 'a contemporary of Jonathan the Asmonaean.' But this suggestion is little more than a guess and entirely without historical support. Kuenen later abandoned it.

(*c*) By far the greatest support is given to the theory that the name 'Sadducees' is derived from the Zadok who was priest in Jerusalem in the time of David and Solomon.[5] This

[1] Cf. Montet (*Essai sur les origines*, &c.), Schürer, Eaton, Cowley, and others.
[2] So Oesterley, Cowley.
[3] Vide Taylor's *Sayings of the Fathers*, p. 112 f.
[4] *Religion of Israel.*
[5] Cf. 1 Kings i. 8, 26, 32 ff; ii. 35; iv. 4; also 1 Chron. xxix. 22.

proposed identification, first advanced by Geiger, was opposed by Montet and Kuenen. Later Kuenen changed his mind and supported it, and to-day it is generally accepted as the most probable.

The appointment of Zadok[1] to the priesthood in place of Abiathar is a striking incident in the reign of Solomon, and, according to the Chronicler, the descendants of Zadok retained their favoured position down to the Exile. This position would be greatly strengthened by the operation of the Deuteronomic Code which limited all sacrifice to the Temple at Jerusalem. When during the Exile Ezekiel made his anticipatory sketch of the new Temple which should be built in Jerusalem on the Return from captivity, he definitely limited the priesthood to the 'sons of Zadok,' on account of their greater faithfulness to Jehovah.[2] Our knowledge of the period from the Return to the coming of the Greeks is unfortunately far from complete, but from such information as is afforded by the Chronicler and the writer of 'P,' it would appear that, whereas the descendants of Ithamar were admitted to the inferior priesthood, the high-priesthood was reserved for the 'sons of Zadok.'[3]

In the recently published Hebrew text of a portion of the Book of Ecclesiasticus a brief passage occurs which, if reliable, throws much light on the position of the Zadokite priesthood at (approximately) the beginning of the second century B.C. It appears in a section following chapter li. 12 in the Greek translation, and runs as follows: 'Give thanks unto Him that hath chosen the sons of Zadok for the priesthood; for His mercy endureth for ever' (verse ix. of the new section). Of this verse and the three immediately preceding Oesterley says: 'It is probable that originally verses vi.–ix. formed a separate piece, and belonged to the book in its original form.'[4] It would seem, therefore, that about 200 B.C. the Zadokites had the primary, or sole, claim to the priesthood. The omission of this passage from the later Greek version[5] may be due to the fact that, when it was made, the Hasmoneans, who were

[1] Zaddok, Zadduk, Zaddouk, and Zaddoukh are variations of the word, so that the letter *u* rather than *o* in 'Sadducees' presents no difficulty.

[2] Ezek. xl. 46; xliii. 19; xliv. 15; xlviii. 11.

[3] Cf. Num. iv. 28; 1 Chron. xxiv. 4–6.

[4] Com. Ecclus. (*C. B. S. C.*), p. 349.

[5] Made soon after 132 B.C.

not Zadokites, had usurped priestly functions, and to save the writer from appearing to contradict contemporary history the editor omitted it. The Zadokites (or Sadducees), therefore, up to the days of the Hasmonean usurpation had been pre-eminently the priestly party, and all who subsequently associated with them came to be known by the same name. In course of time, as we shall see, this party came to be regarded as the aristocracy of the land.

In a recent volume[1] Gustav Hölscher, while deriving the name from Zadok, argues that it was given to the party by their opponents, the 'pious,' in the Roman period. By thrusting upon them this nickname the Pharisees wished to accuse them of the same unpatriotic tendencies which marked the Zadokite Hellenizers in the time of Antiochus Epiphanes. Ingenious as is this suggestion, however, it fails to take account either of the testimony regarding the earlier usage of the name, or of the undeniably religious pre-occupations of the Sadducees as revealed in the Gospel narratives. Hölscher is doubtless right on another point, when he contends that the party at this later date included many others besides the high-priests and their families, as, for example, the rich, the landed proprietors, the business men, the military class and the customs-lessees.[2]

3. One further theory has been advanced by A. E. Cowley,[3] viz. that the word 'Sadducees' has its origin in the Persian word 'Zindik.' 'In modern Persian the word "Zindik" is used in the sense of Manichaean, or, in a general sense, for "infidel," one who does not believe in the resurrection or in the omnipotence of God. It has been adopted in Arabic with the meaning of "infidel," and also in Armenian. Mas'udi (tenth century) says that the name arose in the time of Manes to denote his teaching, and explains that it is derived from the Zend, or explanation of the Avesta. The original Avesta was the truly sacred book, and a person who followed only the commentary was called a Zindik, as one who rejected the word of God to follow worldly tradition, irreligious.' 'It is quite possible that the Persian word was used about 200 B.C. in the sense of Zoroastrian, and, if so, it might well be applied by opponents to a party in Judea who sympathized with foreign

[1] Hölscher, *Der Sadduzäismus* (1906). [2] Ibid., pp. 106 f.
[3] *E.B.*, art. 'Sadducees,' 4236.

ideas, and rejected beliefs which were beginning to be regarded as distinctively Jewish.' And just as in later Jewish literature 'Epicuraeans' are spoken of as 'free-thinkers' without any suggestion that they held the particular doctrines of Epicurus, so, it is suggested, the Sadducees were similarly condemned as too sympathetically disposed towards current foreign thought.

It ought, perhaps, to be added that the author of this theory propounds it 'with great diffidence.' Hitherto it has made little headway, for though Oesterley and Box supported it at first, they have since declared it to be unsatisfactory.[1] It is certainly an ingenious suggestion, and at first sight captivates the mind. But on further consideration it seems highly improbable. The evidence, to begin with, is too remote from that which it is held to explain. The etymology of a Persian name of the tenth century of our era is not likely to have much relation to a Hebrew word in existence twelve centuries earlier. Then, the recently-discovered Zadokite Fragment, which is most probably of Sadducean origin,[2] testifies to the existence of a Sadducean sect, with many of its well-known doctrinal peculiarities, in the first century (A.D.). In addition to this, Cowley seems to have overlooked a certain glaring contradiction between the history of the Zindiks and that of the Sadducees. As he himself informs us, the Zindiks received their name because of their devotion to the Zend in preference to the Avesta, i.e. to the commentary rather than to the original sacred book. Now in the case of the Sadducees the fact was just the reverse: they held the Law in highest esteem and rejected Pharisaic accretions.[3]

The whole survey, therefore, only confirms the commonly accepted explanation, 'Sons of Zadok,' or 'Zadokites,' as being at the moment the most probable source from which the name 'Sadducees' sprang.

[1] *Bks. of the Apoc.*, p. 134 *n.* Yet J. H. A. Hart regards it as still holding the field (*E. Brit.* 11th ed., art. 'Sadducees').

[2] So Schechter, Lévi, Leszynsky, Charles and G. Margoliouth.

[3] *Vide* Oesterley, op. cit., p. 134.

Chapter IV

ORIGIN

Here we reach the crux of our subject, and upon the conclusions arrived at on this point depends the interpretation of the entire history of the two sects, even whether they are to be regarded as sects at all. The reader would doubtless note in chapter ii. that the account given of their history by Josephus opens quite abruptly. When he first mentions them the two parties are evidently well-defined and practically full-grown. They already possess an influence so considerable that John Hyrcanus, the ruler, finds it necessary to secure the good-will of one of them, and on failing with the one party, which was probably the more powerful at the time, he is obliged to seek the support of the other. But the historian offers no information as to their past history, either how they arose, or what were circumstances or principles of their development. Seeing that when Josephus wrote the Sadducees had disappeared as a party, he may have judged it unnecessary to carry his investigations further back, or, which is quite as probable, may have known nothing more about them. But a true understanding of the later antagonism of the parties is seriously endangered unless something can be learned of their origin and early development. What, then, is behind this screen of silence? Can it be penetrated?

Early Investigators

For many years investigators in different lands have patiently laboured to accomplish this task. Their difficulties have not been few or small, and, with so much obscurity in the records, it is perhaps not surprising that they have arrived at different and even antagonistic conclusions. After the work of Geiger (1863), Wellhausen (1874), and Schürer (1874), it was

for long supposed that the question was closed, but after a certain lapse of time their conclusions have been tested afresh and with varying results. Elbogen (1904), Friedländer (1905), Hölscher (1906), Chwolson (1908), Caspari (1909), Herford (1912), Leszynsky (1912), and Lauterbach (1913) have all made important contributions to the subject, and quite recently the points in dispute have again been canvassed in the pages of the *Expositor* by Eerdmans, Segal, and Box. And it is noteworthy that, while many questions have been raised, the battle has raged chiefly around the subjects of the present and succeeding chapters, viz. how the two parties came into being, and what were the principles, prejudices, or antagonisms which governed their development. Of the Pharisees it is asserted by some that they were merely a sect, striving for the acceptance of their peculiarly strict views of the law, both written and oral; others, again, maintain that they were not a sect, but the upholders of genuine Judaism, and always constituted the main stream of Jewish thought and life. In regard to the Sadducees the divergence in opinion is at least as great: the one side holding that their differences with the Pharisees were mainly religious; the other that they were a mere social or political aristocracy to whom religion was of little importance. Which of these views is correct, or whether either is so absolutely, is obviously a matter of essential importance to any one who wishes to understand the play of forces in the two centuries preceding the Advent of Jesus Christ, and the two parties with whom in His lifetime He came into conflict.

Cleavage after the Exile

It is a trite but important reflection that parties, however rigid when fully developed, generally begin in nothing more definite than tendencies or temperamental differences, and this was largely true of the Pharisees and Sadducees. To reach this beginning we are driven back to Nehemiah and Ezra and the great reforms which they introduced in the fifth century B.C.[1] It was about the middle of that century that these visitors from Babylon found the Jews in danger of losing

[1] Whether Nehemiah was the earlier (as the present writer holds) or Ezra does not affect this summary statement.

national and religious distinctiveness by their friendliness with ' heathen ' neighbours. Against this they set themselves with the energy of deep conviction. With merciless severity they attacked the 'mixed marriages' which had become so common, not only forbidding them in the future, but even insisting that all existing foreign wives should be put away.[1] So drastic a regulation touched the people to the quick, and perhaps the wonder is that the reform attained any success at all. Many certainly refused to comply, though while Nehemiah remained in Jerusalem the disobedience was concealed. But ties of affection and, probably, a quite genuine disbelief in the reality of the alleged danger ultimately prevailed, once the Reformer had departed to Babylon, and old associations resumed their sway. When, therefore, Nehemiah paid his second visit to the Holy City he found to his horror ' Jews that had married women of Ashdod, of Ammon, and of Moab : and their children spake half in the speech of Ashdod, and could not speak in the Jews' language, but according to the language of each people.'[2] Nor were the defaulters to be found only among the rank and file of people, even the high-priestly families being offenders. We are told, for instance, that the grandson of Eliashib, the high-priest, had married the daughter of Sanballat the Horonite, and submitted to expulsion from the community rather than put her away.[3] Josephus narrates a similar incident,[4] which may be only a variation of the same story in another chronological setting, or, as some hold, another instance of the same spirit of resistance a century later. Possibly, also, the Book of Ruth, which seems to belong to this period, affords further evidence of the cleavage created by the rigour of the new demands. For in the garb of a beautiful idyll of earlier days there is the implication that if Ruth the Moabitess could be the ancestress of one so great as David, the banning of ' mixed marriages ' was unnecessary and harsh. This divergence of view has indeed never been long absent from religious history. The strict and the lax, the narrow and the broad, are opposed to each other by temperament, and each sees in the other a danger to progress. Among the Jews the opposition never entirely disappeared.

[1] Cf. Ezra x. and Neh. xiii. 23–31.
[2] Neh. xiii. 23 f.
[3] Neh. xiii. 28.
[4] *Ant.* xi., viii. 2.

This strife of ideas and mode of life was greatly accentuated by the exalted position occupied by the high-priests under the Persian and Greek rulers. The Jewish community was cemented together by a blend of religion and nationality, the two elements being inseparable, and the high-priest was its natural and undisputed head.[1] The position, however, had its dangers owing to the leaders' necessary contact with the outside world and its political rulers. It was, of course, in the interest of the Jews themselves that cordial relations should be maintained with external powers, but the reaction of such intercourse on the high-priests themselves proved too strong to be resisted, and often produced a spirit of 'worldliness' little helpful to the maintenance of the exclusiveness of the religion they represented. Around them, too, gathered the wealthier and more prominent families, whose business and tastes made them peculiarly susceptible to the influences then prevalent outside Judea, and less disposed to conform to the narrower outlook and stricter habits of their own people. Thus, in course of time, the coterie, of which the high-priest was generally the centre, came to be regarded by the Rigorists as a menace to the purity of religion, and in all likelihood the references to the 'godless' in some of the later Psalms were intended as a condemnation of their life and conduct. Still, it would be a mistake to suppose that these 'liberals' were opposed to their ancestral law and religion; on the contrary, they would have claimed that they were upholding it in a reasonable way, and at the same time adapting its decrees to the needs of the new day. Thus a century passed.

Alexander and Hellenistic Influences

Then came Alexander the Great (332 B.C.), and, following his conquest, an overwhelming current of Hellenistic influences, all strange and challenging, touching religion, art, government, language, amusements; they came as a torrent flooding the

[1] 'The highest place among the native population was occupied by the "elders" or "nobles," the hereditary representatives of the families settled in the capital. . . . An officer, however, who at first ranked alongside these, soon rose above them all, even above the descendants of David,—the high-priest. He ruled in the sanctuary, and administered temple dues paid by all alike. The sacred office, therefore, easily became a prize for the ambitious and avaricious, and occasionally an object of sanguinary struggle.' As Josephus says (*Ant.*, XI. iv. 8; XX. x.) 'the constitution was accordingly an aristocratic oligarchy' (*Guthe, E. B.*, 2258).

whole life and habits of the people. During the century immediately succeeding, when the Ptolemies were in the ascendant in Palestine, these ideas and customs made steady and ever-increasing progress by their own sheer force and attractiveness. Indeed, had it not been for the precipitate and tyrannical attempt of Antiochus Epiphanes (176–164 B.C.) to force the pace, and at one blow compel the Jews to abandon the religion and customs of their fathers, it seems not at all improbable that the ' peaceful penetration ' of the new culture would have exterminated Judaism altogether. As it was, Hellenism and Judaism now entered into deadly conflict with each other What made the danger to Judaism all the greater was that acceptance of the invading civilization offered the passport to wealth and political preferment. Nor were the ecclesiastical leaders and their associates the only ones who succumbed, the people themselves being likewise seduced. ' In those days there came forth out of Israel lawless men, and persuaded many, saying, " Let us go and make a covenant with the nations that are round about us ; for since we separated ourselves from them many evil things have come upon us." And the saying appeared good in their eyes ; and as certain of the people were eager (to carry this out), they went to the king and he gave them authority to introduce the customs of the Gentiles. And they built a gymnasium in Jerusalem according to the manner of the Gentiles. They also submitted themselves to uncircumcision, and repudiated the holy covenant ; yea, they joined themselves to the Gentiles, and sold themselves to do evil . . . the priests were no longer interested in the services of the altar, but, despising the sanctuary and neglecting the sacrifices, they hurried to take part in the unlawful displays held in the palaestra after the quoit-throwing had been announced, thus setting at naught what their fathers honoured, and esteeming the glories of the Greeks above all else.' [1]

It must not be supposed, however, that the Hellenizers, as they were now called, had the field all to themselves, or the crisis which was fast approaching would have ended differently. The ' Rigorists,' led by the growing body of Scribes, pursued their way of opposition undaunted, teaching and practising the commands of the Law with ever-increasing diligence. Many

1 Macc. i. 11 ff. ; 2 Macc. iv. 14 f. ; cf. *Ant.*, XII. v. 1.

of the most determined banded themselves together into a party which came to be known by the name of Hasidim (or Hasideans),[1] and though the record of their activities is but slight, they undoubtedly played an important part in withstanding Hellenizing encroachments. 'They were the party of those who had laid to heart the teaching of the Scribes; they were so devoted to the law as not even to defend themselves when attacked by the Syrians on the Sabbath; they observed strictly the laws as to purification, and insisted upon complete separation from the Gentiles.'[2] Though later on they supported the Maccabean revolt in its initial stages, their main concern was religion, not politics, and once a high-priest of true Aaronic descent was appointed, and, as they believed, religion was no longer in danger, they withdrew from the conflict. Their zeal concentrated itself so exclusively upon religion that they refused to fight even for the independence of their nation.[3]

Thus were the two sections set in array against each other; on the one hand the Hellenizers, including the high-priest (usually), the aristocracy, and many of the people; and on the other hand, the Scribes, the Hasideans, and numbers who sympathized with their rigorous maintenance of the Law. At last the determined and brutal attempt of Antiochus Epiphanes, aided by many Jewish sympathizers, to Hellenize Palestine outright roused the maddened people to active resistance (167 B.C.), and after varying fortunes, under the leadership of the Maccabees, success rewarded their efforts. Hellenism, as an openly aggressive force, was crushed, and the national religion so firmly re-established that never again was it in danger of being overthrown.

What, then, was the effect of this successful uprising on the two great parties? According to the logic of events the Hellenizers were extinguished, and the Rigorists triumphant all along the line. But this was only true in appearance and for a time.

[1] חסידים from חסד pious; Gr. Ἀσιδαῖοι.

[2] Eaton, art. 'Pharisees' *H. D. B.*; Charles, *B. O. N. T.* p. 117 f; cf. 1 Macc. vii. 12 f.; ii. 42, 32 ff.; i. 62 f.; 2 Macc. vi. 18 ff.; xiv. 38. Enoch xc. 6, 7; *Assump Mos.* v. 2; *Zad. Frag.* i. 5.

[3] Cf. Foakes Jackson and Lake, *Beg. of Christianity*, i. p. 88.

Maccabean Revolt,—Aftermath

After 163 B.C. the war, which at the beginning was mainly in the interests of religion, became a struggle for national independence, and in pursuing this larger aim, the ways of the Hasmoneans (as the Maccabees were called) were not always directed by the strict principles of their faith. The leaders found it expedient to ally themselves with the Gentiles,[1] and openly associated with Syrian kings or would-be kings. How far this friendliness went may be seen in their willingness to make Greek additions to their original Hebrew names, and even to accept nomination to the high-priesthood at the hands of the Syrian ruler.[2] These and similar actions had a great, if diverse, effect on the two opposing parties, who might otherwise have supposed their work done. Whatever exultation the Legalists may have felt at the beginning of the Maccabean revolt it was short-lived. Probably they were disposed to regard the struggle for independence with warm approval though taking no part in it themselves; but when they found the Hasmonean leaders acting towards surrounding peoples after the manner of Gentile monarchs, it must have come upon them as a great shock. Suspicion developed into hostility when Jonathan and his successors dared to add the high-priesthood to their civil dignity. For, not only were the Hasmoneans, though priests, outside the proper high-priestly succession, but to the Legalists it was a profane thing for the high-priest either to accept nomination from, or act on terms of intimacy with, Gentile rulers. These errors made harmony impossible, and placed an impassable barrier between Hasideans and Hasmoneans. Obviously there was little likelihood under such circumstances of the Rigorists imagining that their work was accomplished.

They had to fight on.

As for the old Hellenizing party, one may well suppose that, when the great storm burst, they would be only too glad to escape into obscurity lest the anger of the people should turn against them. But when this fury had exhausted itself on the Syrian oppressors, and with victory came a new attempt at friendliness with the foreigners, the watchful Hellenizers must

[1] 1 Macc. viii. 17, xii. 1 ff., xiv. 24.

[2] 1 Macc. x. 26 ff., 65; xi. 27 f., 57 ff.; xiv. 38, 41–47.

have viewed the turn of events with a satisfaction only comparable with the dismay of the Hasideans. All unexpectedly nearly everything they had desired and laboured for was quietly coming to pass, and their apparent defeat turning to actual victory. Association with outsiders, reasonable modification of the strict demands of the Law—these aims of their own were actually now being championed by the leaders of the revolt! They had, indeed, lost for the time the office of high-priest, and with it the position they had held so long at the head of the nation, but there could be no doubt that the future of their party lay with the Hasmonean rulers, and this they were not slow to recognize and take advantage of.

Thus it had come to pass that the great Maccabean movement, which had been inspired at first by devotion to the Law and guided by its chief upholders and advocates, after defeating its external foes, ended by accepting to a large extent the standpoint of the Hellenizers. The ancient conflict therefore remained in being, and when parties similar to the Legalists and Hellenizers appear in the reign of John Hyrcanus (135–105 B.C.), it is not difficult to see in the Pharisees the old Rigorists or Hasideans, and in the Sadducees the old Hellenizers.

Lauterbach's Theory

A new and striking theory has been advanced recently by Jacob Z. Lauterbach[1] which has gained the approval of Canon Box in his article on the Pharisees in *E. R. E.* Though not contradicting the foregoing directly, it emphasizes other considerations. The writer's line of thought may be summarized as follows:

1. The Law given by Ezra was entrusted to the priests as its official teachers and interpreters, and because of this they became known as the Sopherim.[2] Laymen may have been included in their number, but priests alone were recognized by the Law (Deut. xvii.). The Persian period was comparatively uneventful, but when, later, new conditions rendered the existing Law inadequate, some new customs and practices were authorized by the priests, acting on the authority of Deut. xvii. 8–13. The method employed was two-fold: by

[1] *Jewish Quarterly Review* (New ser., vols. v. and vi., 1914–16); also *Studies in Jewish Literature*, dedicated to Kohler, pp. 176–198.

[2] Sing. Sofer (סופר), from Sefer Ha Torah (ספר התורה) the Book of the Law.

new interpretations of the Law; and by slight changes in its text, of which the Sopherim had complete control.

2. The Sopherim, who, no doubt, formed some kind of an authoritative organization with the high-priest at its head,[1] came to an end about 300–270 B.C. on the death of Simeon the Just I, i.e. with the change from Persian to Greek rule. Then ensued a period of religious anarchy for about eighty years (270–190 B.C.). During this interval, when Sopheric authority had ceased, and even the authority of the high-priests was undermined, certain laymen arose, acquired an influence equal to that of the high-priests, and became leaders of the people. In consequence of the absence of authority new customs and practices now grew up, entirely independent of the Law, and were adopted as part of the religious life. Some, however, remained faithful to the laws and traditions of the fathers, studying the Law in the way it had been taught by the Sopherim. This strange upheaval brought about two great results: the study of the Law was popularized, and this smoothed the way for non-priestly teachers; also the text of the Book of the Law became fixed, attaining a sacred, unchangeable character. Some of the faithful were priests, but for about half a century neither they nor the new lay teachers had any recognized authority. After a time, however, the lay teachers began to lay claim to the authority which had formerly been the prerogative of the priests.

3. This chaotic state of affairs lasted for about eighty years, until another great change took place which brought the religious anarchy to an end. This happened about the year 190 B.C. when an authoritative Council of priests and laymen was again established. This new Council, or Sanhedrin, assumed religious authority to teach and interpret the Law, and proceeded to regulate the life of the community according to the religion of the fathers.[2] As evidence of this revival Lauterbach refers to the letter alleged to have been sent by Antiochus III (the Great) and quoted by Josephus;[3] also to references in the recently recovered Zadokite Fragment.[4] A serious problem now confronted this revived body. As already stated, new practices and customs had grown up independently of the Law; in addition, Hellenistic influences had broadened

[1] *J. Q. R.*, vi., p. 36. [2] Ibid., vi., p. 45. [3] *Ant.*, xii. iii. 3.
[4] Schechter's ed. Text A, p. 1, lines 5 ff.; p. 6, lines 2 and 3.

the people's outlook and modified their religious conceptions; likewise, many decisions had been reached which had no authoritative recognition. To ignore all these was impossible, as they had now become part of the common religious life. The Senate must begin its career by authorizing them. But how? Different solutions were proposed. The *Priestly Group* were conservative, holding by the old view, viz. that all should obey the Written Law to which the people had pledged themselves in Ezra's time; and if changed circumstances demanded new laws or regulations these must be made by the priests in accordance with Deut. xvii., and in all cases treated as subordinate to the Written Law (Torah). The *Lay Group*, in which the Hasidim bulked largely, were, however, unwilling to accept a proposal which gave such powers to the priests alone, protesting that their authority had been bestowed upon them as teachers, not as priests, and that lay teachers had equal rights and authority.

4. Thus a cleavage made itself manifest, which deepened as the discussion proceeded. Two methods were suggested by which to regularize the prevailing religious lawlessness: (1) the further development of the old Expositions (Midrashim) of the Sopherim, and the invention of new rules of exegesis; (2) the bold declaration that some laws had always been handed down orally, and had never been connected with the Book of the Law. The lay teachers finally decided to use both methods, and, after a time, themselves came to believe that the oral traditions were of ancient date and emanated from Moses himself. Naturally, the Priestly group were bitterly opposed to this procedure, and as it was not difficult for them to dispute the new expositions, which were alleged to be based on Scripture, the lay party took refuge more and more in the traditions.

5. This proclamation of the existence of an ancient Oral Law alongside the Written Law, hesitatingly maintained at first, was afterwards boldly asserted. This was necessary in order to free the latter from the fetters of literal interpretation forced upon it by the conservative opposition. The party which held by the Written Law alone developed into the party of the Sadducees, and the upholders of the equal authority of Tradition into that of the Pharisees.

So far this remarkably ingenious theory has escaped serious

criticism. Canon Box, indeed, favours it: 'Lauterbach's reconstruction, sketched above, gives the best explanation that has yet been proposed to account for the somewhat complicated facts.'[1] But, owing possibly to lack of space, he does not submit it to that careful examination which must follow ere long. Here we can only suggest two or three tests which the theory must pass, if it is to take a permanent place in the reconstruction of the subject:

(1) Were laymen before 270 B.C. so entirely excluded from association with the Law that a revolt was necessary, and one so serious that the words 'anarchy' and 'schism' may be used to describe it?
(2) Is there any evidence that the work of the Sopherim (Scribes) or men of a similar type came to an end about 270 B.C., and that then a period of anarchy ensued, during which lay teachers arose and for the first time attained power?
(3) Was the Council, mentioned by Antiochus III about 190 B.C., revived at that date, and were laymen then for the first time allowed to take part in its proceedings?

Examination of the Theory

We choose these points because they are vital to Lauterbach's theory, and if the affirmative cannot be established, or at least made appear probable, the theory, as we hold, cannot be maintained. Admittedly the period is obscure and we often lose sight of the track, but all the more necessary is it that when it reappears we should be guided by the direction in which it points.

1. Let us begin by examining the allegation that before 270 B.C. the laity were excluded from legal activities. Now, there can be little doubt that at this time the high-priest did usually occupy the first place in both civil and religious affairs. But even here it should be borne in mind that the Elephantiné Papyri refer to a Persian (civil) Governor at *circa* 411 B.C. Lauterbach refers[2] to Hag. ii. 11 and Mal. ii. 7 to prove that the priests were in these days the only legal instructors and arbitrators in legal difficulties. But Haggai certainly, and

[1] *E. R. E.*, ix. 833, art. 'Pharisees.' [2] *Studies*, p. 180.

Malachi probably, appeared before the advent of Nehemiah and Ezra, and cannot be adduced as witnesses of what occurred afterwards. Moreover, the regulation contained in Deuteronomy must be taken into account. Here[1] the 'judge' is found in association with the Priests and Levites in cases of legal difficulty, and, as Driver says: 'It appears reasonable to infer that priests and laymen sat together on the tribunal.'[2]

The later literature, in so far as it touches the question, looks in the same direction. Ezra utilized the services of princes, elders, and judges,[3] who were laymen. '. . . the supreme national authority was absorbed by the high-priest, the only chief whom the Law recognized; while around, but beneath him, there developed out of the loosely organized body of nobles and priests, whom we found under Nehemiah, an aristocratic council, or senate, room for which had also been provided by the Law.'[4]

Passing next to the Chronicler (*circa* 300 B.C.), we have one who, though a doubtful witness to the early period to which he refers, very probably reflects quite accurately the Jewish constitution of his own time, and, say, a couple of generations immediately preceding it. He tells us of princes who 'teach in the cities of Judah,' and of 'heads of the fathers' houses of Israel,' as well as Levites and Priests who were appointed 'for the judgement of the Lord and for controversies.'[5] On this a recent commentator remarks: 'They (i.e. the Chronicler and his school) ascribed to him (Jehoshaphat) the foundation of a system of courts corresponding perhaps to those of their day when in all probability a central Sanhedrin existed at Jerusalem and local ones in other cities.'[6] Moses Gaster is even more definite: 'Here we have practically the composition of the high court as it developed in Jerusalem after the Exile . . . they were the living tradition . . . hence their sway over the people.'[7] And, let it be remembered, this high and authoritative court included laymen, princes, elders, and judges.

In his reference to the Scribes (Sopherim) Lauterbach says: 'It is doubtful if there were any laymen, i.e. non-priests, among the Sopherim, but even if so, they had little influence and no

[1] Deut. xvii. 9, 12; xix. 17.
[2] *Com. Deut.*, p. 208 (*I. C. C.*).
[3] Ezra ix. 1; x. 8, 14.
[4] G. A. Smith, *Jerus.*, ii. 351; cf. i. 380–4.
[5] 2 Chron. xvii. 7–9; xix. 8–11.
[6] Curtis, *Com. on Chron.*, p. 402 (*I. C. C.*).
[7] *E. R. E.*, ix, 553 a, art. 'Ordination' (Jewish).

official authority.[1] So far as evidence is available it does not support this view. The Chronicler tells us of 'the families of Scribes which dwelt at Jabez; the Tirathites, the Shimeathites, the Sucathites,'[2] who apparently formed a guild of non-members of the priesthood. And as Curtis observes: 'The mention of the Scribes shows clearly that we have a post-exilic notice, since it is doubtful whether families of them existed earlier.'[3] Whatever value Sirach may possess for the century preceding his own time (*circa* 190 B.C.), he certainly stands as a witness against Lauterbach's assertion. For in his well-known passage[4] on the vocation and influence of the Scribe he nowhere suggests that the office was necessarily or even generally confined to the priesthood. It seems probable, indeed, that the Scribe and the Wise Man were often found in the same person. 'For the most part, during this period, and even down to the time of Sirach, a Scribe might be a Priest, and a Priest might be a Scribe. Their interests were largely the same, but the scribal interest in the Law-book was naturally wider than that of the priests.'[5]

That a conflict did break out between the higher circles of the Priests and the Scribes seems not at all improbable, but if so, it began at an early date after the Return and covered a considerable period of time. There is no known reason for deferring it, as Lauterbach does, to so late a time as the beginning of the third century B.C.[6]

(2) We may now turn to the second of Lauterbach's main assertions, viz. that the work of the Sopherim ceased after Simon I (*circa* 270 B.C.), and that a period of religious anarchy ensued. (*a*) This was brought about by the change from Persian to Greek rule; and (*b*) the evidence is seen in the inability of the Mishnah to find the name of a single teacher from 270 to 190 B.C., i.e. between the latest possible date of Simon's death and the time of Antigonos.[7] Thus the influx of Greek influence which followed the visit of Alexander the Great, and the absence of any names of Scribes after Simeon the Just, are

[1] *Studies*, p. 180.

[2] 1 Chron. ii. 55.

[3] *Com. on Chron.*, p. 98 (*I. C. C.*).

[4] Ecclus. xxxviii. 24—xxxix. 11.

[5] Moffatt, art. 'Scribes,' *E. R. E.*, xi. 272; J. D. Prince (*E. B.*), and Oest. and Box (*Relig. Syn.*) might be quoted to the same effect.

[6] Cf. Gaster, art. 'Ordination' (Jewish), *E. R. E.*, ix. 553 b; also G. A. Smith, *Jerus.*, i. 394 f.

[7] *J. Q. R.*, vi., pp. 37 and 39.

the reasons given for the alleged disappearance of all authoritative teaching and the resulting state of anarchy—truly a weighty conclusion based on a slender and uncertain basis of fact.

(*a*) In regard to the alleged cause of this great change, it cannot be doubted that the advent and triumphal progress of Alexander throughout the East greatly affected the environment of Jewish life. But there is no evidence to justify the surmise that the sacred position of the high-priest and his scribal coadjutors was at any time destroyed or even seriously in jeopardy. The proximity of the new Greek cities in Palestine, each with its democratic Council, would naturally emphasize the rights of the laity, especially in the local communities, and if the Jewish laity had had no place allowed them in the work of government and instruction the effect might have been revolutionary. But, as we have already shown, the laity, from Ezra onward, had never been ignored, and the whole system of government was too firmly established and based on sanctions too sacred to be overthrown thus summarily by an outside civilization of whose value many Jews were probably greatly in doubt. Indeed, it seems much more probable that now, as at a later date, the Hellenistic menace would only serve to stimulate the Scribes, Priests, and laymen alike, to more zealous activity in the teaching of their own laws and customs. To these considerations, based like Lauterbach's own on an estimate of probabilities, may be added the well-known historical fact that, when the history emerges again into the clear daylight, it is the high-priestly party which shows itself most susceptible to the new influences, i.e. the heads of the very constitution which, on Lauterbach's hypothesis, had suffered temporary destruction from the influence of Hellenism, now show themselves most in favour of it!

(*b*) Again, the disappearance of the names of particular Sopherim between 270 and 190 B.C. is not really surprising when the extreme obscurity of the time is taken into account.[1] But even apart from this, the dates of Simeon the Just and Antigonos of Socho are far too uncertain to admit of any dogmatic assumption of a gap of eighty years between. To begin with, it is not easy to identify the Simeon mentioned in

[1] Cf. G. A. Smith, *Jerus.*, ii., 352.

the Pirke Aboth, whether, that is, he is the first of that name, as Lauterbach assumes, who died about 270 B.C., or his grandson, who was high-priest from 219 to 199 B.C.[1] Equally uncertain is the date of Antigonos of Socho. As Travers Herford remarks: 'His date, being dependent on that of Simeon the Just, is uncertain.'[2] Louis Ginzberg, in the *Jewish Encyclopaedia*, is just as much in doubt: 'He flourished about the first half of the third century B.C.'[3] It seems, therefore, more than a little hazardous to stake much on the alleged hiatus of eighty years between these two men.

Mention has already been made of a passage in praise of the scribe by Sirach,[4] and we may return to it for a moment. Sirach's work dates from the close of the period of anarchy postulated by Lauterbach, and is therefore of great importance. It is extremely difficult to believe that, if a period of scribal chaos had just come to an end, this volume could have escaped some, if only the faintest reference to it. Yet nowhere does Sirach convey the idea that the labours of the Scribes had suffered a long lapse of eighty years, or that they had ever been divorced from their usual ecclesiastical authority. Moreover, his references to 'the wise,' 'the men of understanding,' 'the just men,'[5] go far to lead the reader to the conclusion that these two classes had long been closely associated in Jewish life.

Whatever cleavage was destined to arise between the high-priestly party and the pious at a later stage, there is therefore no suggestion of it here. And when it did occur it was not a strife between the ecclesiastics and the laity, with priests and priestly scribes on the one side and the anti-clerics on the other, but a contest between the Hellenistic tendencies of the high-priestly coterie and the legalistic rigidity of 'the pious,' who included both priests and laymen.

(3) One further assertion of Lauterbach's remains to be tested. This is to the effect that, about 190 B.C., the Council, or Senate, was revived, and laymen for the first time admitted to it. It is not the vexed question of the so-called Great Synagogue which is here under consideration, but the revival of a Council, by express permission of Antiochus the Great,[6]

[1] *Vide* note by Travers Herford in *Apoc. and Pseud.*, ii., 691.
[2] Ibid. [3] *J. E.*, i., 629. [4] Cf. Ecclus. xxxviii. 24 to xxxix. 11.
[5] Cf. Ecclus. vi. 33 ff.; ix. 14 ff.; xiv. 20 ff. [6] 223–187 B.C.

which succeeded in bringing to an end the period of eighty years' anarchy. According to Lauterbach, it was at this Council that the final cleavage took place between the priestly and lay factions which issued at length in our two sects, the Sadducees and the Pharisees.

For proof we are referred to a letter of Antiochus, preserved by Josephus, and to certain passages in the Zadokite Fragment, recently discovered and issued by Schechter. On the passage in Josephus,[1] he remarks: 'After Judea came under the rule of Antiochus the Great, a Senate or Gerousia, composed of priests and lay teachers, was organized to rearrange and regulate the life of the people according to the laws of their fathers.'[2] Elsewhere he refers to the Senate as 'again established' and 're-organized.'[3] The implication is that the Senate had fallen into disuse, probably when the alleged anarchy broke out in 270 B.C., and that it was now restored for the special purpose of rebuilding the broken walls of religious authority. Let us now turn to the letter of Antiochus, on which this theory is largely based:

> 'Since the Jews, on our first entrance into their country . . . received us in a splendid manner and came to meet us with their Senate,' &c.
>
> . . . . . .
>
> 'And let all of that nation live according to the laws of their own country; and let the Senate and the Priests and the Scribes of the temple and the sacred singers, be discharged from the poll-tax and crown-tax and other taxes also. . . .'[4]

We are not concerned with the historical value of this letter, but, taking it as it stands, as Lauterbach does, we fail to find in it any justification for the assertion that the Senate was reorganized or revived at this time. On the contrary, it clearly implies its actual existence, just as it does that of the officials mentioned. This is evidently the view of Oesterley, who, in a comment on 1 Macc. xii. 6, says: 'This Gerousia is mentioned as being already in existence in the time of Antiochus the Great (cf. Jos., *Ant.*, XII. iii. 3); the earliest reference to it is, however, 2 Chron. xix. 8.'[5]

[1] Ant., XII. iii. 3. [2] *Studies*, p. 181. [3] *J. Q. R.*, New Ser., vi., pp. 45, 53.
[4] Ant., XII. iii. 3; Whiston's translation revised by Shilleto.
[5] *Apoc. and Pseud.*, i., p. 111.

The passages quoted from the Zadokite Fragment are generally admitted to be obscure, though it is quite probable that they refer to 190 B.C., or thereabouts, and to the confusions which arose through Hellenism. These passages are as follows :

> ' But when He remembered the covenant of the forefathers He left a remnant to Israel and gave them not over to extermination. And at the end (or, in the period) of the wrath, 390 years after He had delivered them from the hand of Nebuchadnezzar, the King of Babylon, He remembered them, and made bud (or, spring forth) from Israel and Aaron a root of a plant to inherit His land, and to rejoice in the good of His earth.'
>
> . . . . . .
>
> ' But God remembered the covenant with the forefathers. And He took from Aaron men of understanding and from Israel wise men and made them understand, and they digged the well. The princes digged the well ; they digged it, the nobles of the people, by the lawgiver. The well is the law,' &c.[1]

Lauterbach's contention is that this new devotion to the Law came to birth in the revived Sanhedrin, and took the form of a new sect which opposed the Priest-Sadducees and the Israelite-Pharisees, the parties then dominant. But a far simpler interpretation is that which sees in these passages an allusion to the Hasidim, who, as is well known, arose at this juncture in opposition to the Hellenizing tendencies of the high-priestly circle. There is no ground whatever for supposing that they were members of the Sanhedrin. Far more probably, when they saw the seats of authority occupied by the Hellenizers, they spent their time among the people, instructing them in the Law as they understood it. At any rate, the theory that the Hasidim formed a third party in the Senate is an assumption not yet proved.[2]

On the whole, therefore, we are obliged to conclude that Lauterbach's theory, interesting and suggestive as it undoubtedly is, is without adequate historical support. Whatever

[1] Schechter's ed., *Text A*, pp. 1, 6 ; Charles's ed., *Apoc. and Pseud.*, ii., pp. 800, 812.

[2] Cf. 1 Enoch xc. 6 ; 1 Macc. ii. 42 ; iii. 13 ; *Ass. Mos.*, v. 2.

contest there was in the nation at this time was mainly due to the tendency of the high-priestly party to favour Hellenistic ideas and customs, and their opponents consisted not of laymen only, but of all the 'pious,' both clerical and lay. The alleged period of anarchy is an exaggerated description of the confusion and dismay resulting from the concessions of the Hellenizing section, until it was counteracted and overthrown by the people under the leadership of the Hasidim and, later, the Maccabees. The Senate was already in existence when Antiochus visited Palestine. Of the disputes which raged we know but little, but the assertion that a 'lay' party then created the 'fiction' of an ancient oral tradition is entirely destitute of proof.

Chapter V

PRINCIPLES AND DEVELOPMENT

I. Summary of Different Views.—Just as students differ in their views of the origin of these two sects, so in regard to their development there is no general agreement, and many opposing theories are held. Without doing serious injustice to any of these, we may divide them roughly into two classes: (1) some hold that the Pharisees were a purely religious party, and the Sadducees not religious in any genuine fashion, but merely a social and political clique; (2) others regard both as occupying a definite religious standpoint, the Sadducees representing the more conservative, and the Pharisees the more liberal and progressive elements in the nation.

1. Of the first view there have been, and are still, many distinguished representatives. In details they differ considerably. Some, for instance, assert that the Pharisees were only a sect, others that they represented, throughout their whole existence, the orthodox standpoint of later Judaism, and that those who dissented from them were outside the main stream of the nation's thought and life. As for the Sadducees, a minority, while regarding their social and political preoccupations as their outstanding characteristic, allow that they were not entirely without religious views, genuine, if tepid. The majority, however, strenuously contest this admission, and denounce them as men absolutely indifferent to any but political and social considerations.

Coming to individuals, Wellhausen is of the opinion that the Pharisees were the party of the scribes, and the Sadducees the priests and aristocrats of Jerusalem. And though the latter may, in many instances, have held the same doctrines as the Pharisees, they were opposed to them as a predominantly political to a predominantly religious party.[1] Graetz and

[1] *Die Pharisäer und die Sadducäer*, p. 51.

Schürer[1] share this view in the main. Hölscher[2] argues that Sadducees were not a party at all, and did not consist chiefly of the priestly nobility of Jerusalem, but 'included the rich and distinguished of various classes, proprietors, merchants, military and customs' officials, and the group of the priestly class descended from Simon ben Boethus.' They were thus neither a philosophical school, a religious brotherhood, a political party, nor even a distinct group. Under the powerful influence of Roman ideas and customs they were utterly irreligious, 'the lax, the scoffers who make merry over the strict religious practices of the pious, as the infidels and godless.' M. H. Segal[3] is the most recent advocate of this theory, and his characterization of the two parties, particularly the Sadducees, certainly lacks nothing in incisiveness. Of the Pharisees he says: 'It is, therefore, utterly wrong to describe them as a sect in Judaism, with doctrines and practices different and distinct from the rest of the people. For they were really the representatives of the national religion, as professed and practised, more or less strictly, by the vast majority of the nation.' 'The Sadducees, on the other hand, were secularists. Their aims were exclusively political. They regarded religion as of minor importance, and held that it must always be subordinated to the interests of the State. They would only observe of the national religion as much as, and no more than, was absolutely necessary to maintain their connexion with the people over whom they strove to rule.'

We do not propose to deal in detail with this theory. Probably the best reply we can offer will be found in the attempted reconstruction which comes later. Meanwhile, it may be remarked: (*a*) that the Sadducees are in a somewhat unfortunate position, as most of our information about them comes from quarters which were extremely hostile to their views; (*b*) further, the impression made on most unprejudiced readers by the references to the Sadducees in the New Testament, Josephus, and the Mishnah is certainly not that of indifference to religion; Eerdmans[4] has recently drawn attention to this fact,

[1] Schürer says: 'The Pharisees were by nature the rigidly legal, the Sadducees in the first instance only the aristocrats, who certainly were driven by the historical development into that opposition to Pharisaic legality, which, however, formed no fundamental element of their nature' (op. cit., II. ii. 9).

[2] *Der Sadduzäismus.* [3] Art. in *Expos.*, VIII., xiii., pp. 81–108.

[4] Art. in *Expos.*, VIII., viii., pp. 299–315.

and it is difficult to see how his argument is to be answered; (*c*) one wonders, too, how men whose leaders were so often the national high-priests, and therefore responsible for public worship, can be properly charged with making social and political affairs their sole concern.

2. The other view, which regards both parties as religious, the Sadducees holding tenaciously to the old and the Pharisees representing the progressive forces in the nation, brings us probably nearer to the truth, but also to certain evident inconsistencies on both sides. It really means that the Sadducean party, though so accessible to foreign influences in the ordinary life of business, social customs, and politics, stood rigidly opposed to any developments in their ancient religion, whether evolved from within or imported from without. And that the Pharisees, on the contrary, while immovably antagonistic to foreign influences in their outer life, were quick to adapt their tenets to the growing needs of changing times, and to this end did not hesitate to develop their legal system by unaccustomed methods of exegesis and new regulations, or even to Judaize doctrines which had their origin in Greek or Persian sources.

It is long since N. Krochmal and A. Geiger taught that the Sadducees were conservative, old-world adherents of the Law of Moses, and their opponents liberal reformers who freely adopted new ideas and incorporated them into the old religion, reshaping and remodelling the ancient laws and institutions to suit the needs of changing times. In our own day Kohler[1] describes the Sadducees as the party representing views and practices of the Law and interests of the Temple and Priesthood directly opposite to those of the Pharisees.' Cowley[2] classifies the two parties into progressives and conservatives, and goes on to say that the latter possessed strong political proclivities and consisted mainly of the aristocrats and priests. Leszynsky[3] gives a general adhesion to this theory, the cardinal difference between them arising out of the Messianic hope. J. Z. Lauterbach[4] may also be claimed as a supporter of this view. As already shown, he treats their antagonism to each

[1] *J. E.*, art. 'Sadducees,' x. p. 630. [2] *E. B.*, art. 'Sadducees,' 4237 f.

[3] *Die Sadduzäer*, p. 94 ff.

[4] *J. Q. R.*, New Ser., v., vi., art. 'Midrash and Mishnah'; also *Studies in Jewish Literat.*, pp. 176–198.

other as one of opposition between priests and laymen. But even so, its subject-matter was religion. Eerdmans,[1] after submitting all the evidence to a fresh and detailed scrutiny, also concludes that both Pharisees and Sadducees were religious sects. Canon Box has followed him in the pages of the same Review,[2] and with similar results.

The recent discovery by Schechter of the Zadokite Fragment, despite the uncertainty respecting its precise date, seems to have placed the general question beyond dispute. If, as is generally supposed, this Fragment represents a section of the Sadducean party, there can be no possible doubt that the parent body was far from being merely political.

On the other hand, recent writers like J. D. Prince,[3] Hölscher,[4] and Segal[5] are stoutly opposed to the Sadducees being regarded as a religious party.

On the whole, however, the evidence seems to make this highly probable. This does not mean that the Sadducees were not politicians and aristocrats, or that the Pharisees did not for a long time represent the majority of earnest religious thinkers; but that it is incorrect to describe the former as wholly indifferent to religion, though quite probably many of them, both the high-priests themselves and their sympathizers, approached at times the limits of formalism.

II. Constructive Statement.—We may now make the attempt to state in a positive form what appear to have been the lines along which our two parties developed. Lack of material makes omissions inevitable, but these are not as serious as might have been expected.

1. *The Pharisees.*—The Pharisees were the spiritual descendants of that small but influential party of Hasidim, already mentioned,[6] who played so conspicuous a part at the outbreak of the Maccabean revolt, and then, after their precipitate and sanguine acceptance of Alcimus[7] as high-priest, suddenly disappeared from history. As suggested elsewhere, those upon whom the mantle of the Hasidim fell appear to

[1] *Expos.*, viii., viii., 299–315, art. 'Pharisees and Sadducees.'
[2] *Expos.*, viii., xv., pp. 19 ff., art. 'Sadducees.'
[3] *E. B.*, col. 4322, art. 'Scribes and Pharisees.' [4] Op. cit.
[5] Article already mentioned. [6] Supra, chap. iv; also on the Essenes.
[7] Cf. 1 Macc. vii. 12–17; Bacchides and Alcimus responded by slaying sixty of them.

have split into two parts, one section, the stricter, developing into the Essenes, and the other into the Pharisees. The remark of Schürer, following Wellhausen, that 'the Sadducean party proceeded from the ranks of the priests, the party of the Pharisees from the Scribes'[1] is either too indefinite or actually erroneous. The suggestion that 'priests' and 'scribes' were mutually exclusive classes is not in accord with the evidence. From the days of the priest-scribe Ezra, down to the strife respecting the authority of the Oral Law, the two classes laboured hand in hand, some priests being scribes and some scribes priests. Later, the vast developments of the Traditions doubtless drew the Scribes more and more to the side of those who championed Tradition, but even in New Testament times 'the scribes of the Pharisees'[2] had to be distinguished from others.

The supreme aim of the Pharisees throughout their whole history was devotion to the Law. They feared God and wrought righteousness, and with this felt that their life was complete. Nor must it be forgotten, whatever criticisms may be made of their conception of religion and the methods they adopted to attain their end, that the preservation of Judaism for all future time is very largely due to their pious devotion at a time of dangerous syncretism. They believed that the favour of Jehovah could only be won and retained by the most rigid observance of His laws.[3] To attain this all-important end they co-operated with the Scribes in the development of the Oral Law,[4] which they made as binding as the Torah,[5] so that even in the confusion of the new Greek and Roman times, with all their unanticipated problems and perplexities, the people might know how it was fitting for a Jew to live. Unfortunately, their method had its drawbacks: their followers endured not only the 'burden of the Book,' but also innumerable 'unwritten precepts,' and tended to become so absorbed in obedience to these demands that not infrequently they missed their object and spirit. Whether, as Bousset[6] asserts, 'prayer, fasting, and almsgiving become almost the foundations of the Jewish religion,'

[1] *J. P. T. J. C.*, II. ii, p. 9. [2] Mark ii. 16; Acts xxiii. 9; Luke v. 30.
[3] *War*, II. viii. 14; *Life*, 38; *Ant.*, XVII. ii. 4; XVIII. i. 3; Acts xxii. 3; xxvi. 5; Phil. iii. 5.
[4] *Ant.*, XIII. x. 6, xvi. 2; Mark vii. 3; Matt. xv. 2.
[5] 'It is more culpable to teach contrary to the precepts of the Scribes than contrary to the Torah itself' (*Sanhedrin*, xi. 3).
[6] *Die Relig. des Jud.*, 2nd ed., p. 209.

or as Felix Perles,[1] his critic, would have it, these should be rendered as ' penitence, prayer, and charity,' formalism became an all too common feature of their religious life. But the original aim was beyond reproach.

To what extent, if at all, the Pharisees were *progressive*[2] in thought and doctrine will appear more clearly when we come to consider their teaching. It is, of course, indisputable that Jewish conceptions made extraordinary progress in several directions in the last two centuries B.C., but whether this was due to the deliberate intention of the Pharisaic leaders, or they found themselves carried forward by currents of opinion coming they knew not whence, remains a matter of dispute. It may, however, be safely assumed that with their outlook it is unlikely that they would annex foreign ideas consciously, though these are actually found in their writings and teaching. And, in an atmosphere so impregnated with ideas similar to, if more developed, than their own, it would not be surprising if they quite unconsciously read some of the current conceptions into the old and less pregnant language.

The *real leadership of the people* seems to have been in the Pharisees' hands. Their brief possession of political power under Queen Alexandra soon passed, never to return. But they attained a far greater dominion in their influence over the people of the land (the Am-Ha-Aretz), and, despite the contempt they felt for their religious ignorance, exerted a dominating influence over the popular mind and practices. Josephus tells us that ' they have great influence with the people and whatever they (i.e. the people) do about divine worship or prayers or sacrifices they perform according to their direction.'[3] Herod recognized this extraordinary power, and, wise man that he was, treated its possessors with becoming respect. Even the Sadducees, deeply chagrined no doubt, had to bow before it, addicting ' themselves to the notions of the Pharisees, because the people would not otherwise put up with them.'[4] Influential women also followed their instructions in large numbers.[5]

Nevertheless, it would not be correct to suppose, as some do, that the Pharisees had now ceased to be a party and become

[1] Bousset's *Relig. des Jud. Kritisch untersucht* (quoted by Box, *Rev. Th. and Philos.*, IV. iii. 133).

[2] Geiger, Bousset, and others argue in favour, Schûrer against it.

[3] *Ant.*, XVIII. i. 3; cf. XIII. x. 5 f. [4] *Ant.*, XVIII. i. 4. [5] *Ant.*, XVII. ii. 4.

the one main stream of the nation's life.[1] Though the people's acknowledged leaders, they were probably more respected and admired than obeyed by the majority. And even the Pharisee-historian, Josephus, does not put their number higher than six thousand.[2] They were still only a sect, though a powerful one; they had their own peculiar rules and regulations, e.g. in regard to washing hands, frequent fastings, Sabbath-observance, tithes, oaths,[3] after the manner of a sect. In New Testament times the nation contained, besides Pharisees and Sadducees, Herodians and Essenes and Zealots, yet the great mass of the people is nowhere identified with any one of these parties, or even with the whole.[4] The Am-Ha-Aretz probably outnumbered them all.

Religion being their chief concern, *politics* took a subordinate position. It is customary, and not improper, to contrast the Pharisees in this respect with their rivals, with whom politics bulked so largely. But while it is true that the Pharisees were not politicians, they were far from being indifferent to political affairs where these encroached on the domain of religion. Their record is ample demonstration of this. Even their predecessors, the Hasidim, did not refrain from joining the Maccabeans at the outset, and only withdrew when they deemed religious liberty to be secure. The Pharisees went much further than this, never hesitating to intervene in secular matters if religion could be served. But it is only fair to emphasize that their object was always religious, never secular.

The opposition to John Hyrcanus came from a Pharisee, ostensibly on the ground of his uncertain descent, actually because he united in his own person the two offices of prince and high-priest. The civil war which broke out in the reign of Alexander Jannaeus, with such devastating results, was not improbably due to the Pharisaic objection to his ritual innovations. Under Alexandra Salome the party was not slow to accept political power, and used it for the advancement of their own religious ideas and practices, and the discomfiture of their rivals. The turmoil which preceded the advent of the

[1] J. D. Prince (*E. B.*, art. 'Scribes and Pharisees'), and others.

[2] *Ant.*, XVII. ii. 4.

[3] Cf. Eerdmans in *Expos*, art. cited; also Matt. ix. 11; xv. 1; ix. 14; xii. 2, 10; xxiii. 5, 16, 23.

[4] Segal's argument to the contrary is not convincing. Cf. his art. in *Expos.* already cited.

Romans brought about a more chastened frame of mind, and with it the exceedingly modest request that Pompey would permit them to worship God after their ancient manner. The conclusion to which they came, as shown in the Psalms of Solomon,[1] that Pompey's desecration of the Temple was a divine judgement on the nation, because of the iniquity of the Sadducean sinners, is a further evidence of their keen sensitiveness to political movements.

Under Hyrcanus II it was Sameas,[2] a Pharisee, who withstood the incipient ruthlessness of the youthful Herod, and Sameas and Pollio, his fellow-Pharisee, who counselled the citizens to open the gates of the city to Sosius and Herod.[3] The attitude to Herod when he became king is not easy to understand, whether as Bousset[4] says: 'It is now very remarkable that these same pious knew how to come to terms with the now succeeding foreign rulership of Herod,' or whether, as others would urge, they merely endured him because they could not avoid it. Certainly he treated them exceptionally. When the Pharisees as a body refused to take the usual oath of allegiance to himself and the Romans, Sameas and Pollio[5] suffered nothing in consequence, and the rest of the six thousand Pharisee malcontents were let off with a fine.[6] When at last the nation came under the direct rule of the Romans, and were obliged to pay taxes to the supreme Government, we find the Pharisees asking Jesus whether it is 'lawful' to pay tribute[7] to Caesar, and one can hardly doubt that the lawfulness in question referred to God rather than to man. A final fact may be added, viz. that the Zealots[8] arose partly from the body of the Pharisees. That Zealotry was unfavourably regarded by the vast majority of the party may well be believed, but the ugly fact remains that violence emerged as a sequel to their teaching.

Yet despite all these indisputable facts, it remains true that they had little or no interest in politics as such. Their essential life was religious and their chief concern the Law. And even when they seemed to forsake this, it was with the intention of rendering religion some service in the larger sphere.[9]

[1] Ps. Sol. viii. 12; xvii. 5 ff.; *vide Coms.*
[2] *Ant.*, xv. i. 1.
[3] *Ant.*, xvii. ii 4.
[4] *Relig. des Jud.*, p. 62.
[5] *Ant.*, xv. x. 4.
[6] *Ant.*, xviii. i. 1, 6; *War*, ii. viii. 1.
[7] Mark xii. 14 ff., and parallels.
[8] *Ant.*, xiv. ix. 4.
[9] So Schürer, op. cit., ii. ii. 17; Eaton, *H. D. B.*, iii. 827; Jackson and Lake, *Beg. Christianity*, i. 112 f.

Of their *thoughts and feelings towards the Sadducees*, the Pharisees have left us indubitable evidence in the Book of Enoch and the Psalms of Solomon, two documents written by members of their own party. In chaps. xci.–civ. of Enoch, which R. H. Charles places after the breach of John Hyrcanus with the Pharisees, their opponents are described as 'sinners' who 'tempt men to evilly-entreat wisdom,' 'who rob and sin and strip men naked and acquire wealth and see good days,' 'pervert the words of uprightness and transgress the eternal law,' 'alter and pervert the words of righteousness in many ways,' 'worship stones, and graven images of gold and silver and wood (and stone) and clay, and those who worship impure spirits and demons, and all kinds of idols not according to knowledge.'[1] They are called 'sinners' throughout, and in contrast with the writer's own party, who are 'children of heaven,'[2] 'his children,' and 'the elect,' their rivals are 'children of earth.'[3] Incidentally we learn here that the Sadducees also expressed their feelings in writing,[4] a fact of which we know little or nothing from any other source. The least agreeable feature of all is the spirit of vengeance on the part of the Pharisees: 'Fear not the sinners, ye righteous; for again the Lord will deliver them into your hands that ye may execute judgement upon them according to your desires.'[5]

In a later section of the book, chaps. xxxvii.–lxxi., to be dated after the murderous extravagances of Alexander Jannaeus, the bitterness of the writer has naturally increased. 'Then shall the kings and the mighty perish and be given into the hands of the righteous and holy.'[6] Here the 'mighty' are apparently the Sadducean party who were in league with the king, and are charged with supporting him in his cruelties. In another passage the 'prayers' and 'blood of the righteous' rise up 'from the earth before the Lord of Spirits' 'that judgement may be done unto them'; 'it had been good for them if they had not been born.'"[7]

In the Psalms of Solomon the Pharisaic author describes his own party as the righteous, those that fear the Lord, the saints,

[1] Enoch xciv. 5; cii. 9; xcix. 2; civ. 10; xcix. 7 f.
[2] Enoch ci. 1.
[3] Enoch c. 6.
[4] Enoch xcviii. 15; civ. 10.
[5] Enoch xcv. 3; cf. also xxvii. 2 f.; xlviii. 9; lxxii. 12; xc. 26 f.
[6] Enoch xxxviii. 5.
[7] Enoch xlvii. 1 f.; xxxviii. 2.

the poor or needy.[1] The Sadducees, on the contrary, are the sinners, the profane, the transgressors, the unrighteous.[2] They are charged with perverting wisdom, scattering families, destroying neighbours' houses, with having the tongue of the wicked man, kindling strife with slanderous lips[3]; with gross sensual sins,[4] and the desecration of holy things[5]; they are hypocrites, insolent, self-reliant, and disregard God[6]; in supporting the Hasmoneans 'they laid waste the throne of David with a tumultuous shout of triumph'[7]; and for such Sheol shall be the punishment.[8]

It is not an easy matter to separate the true from the false in all this terrible invective. Of course, the Sadducees must share responsibility for the oppressive deeds of the later Hasmoneans, seeing they were their supporters. But one remembers also the like behaviour of the Pharisees under Alexandra's rule. The alleged profanation of holy things and general perversion of Law is probably the Pharisees' way of condemning their opponents' refusal to accept the Traditions which they themselves held so dear. And as for the sensualities alleged, these cannot be taken in a literal sense. The lust for vengeance and the anticipated joy of seeing their enemies in anguish are perhaps the darkest features in an unpleasant picture.

What was the relation of the party to the *Apocalyptic Movement*? Some writers incline to the view that it was really part of the Pharisaic movement, and there are passages in Canon Charles's writings which look in this direction. It is, of course, generally believed that such outstanding Apocalypses as Enoch, the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs, and the Assumption of Moses owe their origin to Pharisaic inspiration, and were probably written by Pharisaic hands. But it is one thing to speak of Pharisees who sympathized with the Apocalyptists, and quite another to regard the movement, as a whole, as a Pharisaic development. It is certainly of great significance that later Judaism did not admit the most eminent

[1] Ps. Sol. ii. 38; iii. 3–18; ii. 37; iii. 10; v. 2, 13.
[2] Ps. Sol. ii. 38 f.; iv. 1; iv. 21; xii. 6; xv. 6.
[3] Ps. Sol. iv. 11, 13, 15, 23; xii. 2, 4; xvii. 18.
[4] Ps. Sol. ii. 13–15; iv. 4 ff.; viii. 9 ff., 24.
[5] Ps. Sol. i. 8; ii. 3, 5; vii. 2; viii. 13, 26; xvii. 51.
[6] Ps. Sol. iv. 7, 22; iv. 14, 24.
[7] Ps. Sol. xvii. 7 ff.
[8] Ps. Sol. xiv. 4 ff.; xv. 11–14.

Apocalypses, Daniel alone excepted, into the Canon of Scripture. And later Judaism, it must be remembered, was largely the finished product of Pharisaism. Had the party as a whole been devoted Apocalyptists, one can hardly think they would have ignored the books which had played so large a part in forming the ruling ideas of the two preceding centuries. We seem to be on safer ground when we regard it as primarily a people's movement, with which many Pharisees indeed sympathized, as they did with the Zealot Movement, but which existed quite distinct from their own party.

Probably the party in later times consisted very largely of *laymen*. But this was not the case at first, as Lauterbach contends, and only became so as the high-priestly party succumbed more and more to Hellenism and grew in power. It was doubtless difficult for priests to hold Pharisaic views while so dependent on the high-priestly coterie, and probably few succeeded in doing so. Yet the priest Zacharias, mentioned by St. Luke,[1] who is described as 'righteous before God,' seems quite different from the Sadducean type, and possibly many of his class were like him in this respect. Moreover, as Hölscher[2] shows, there were among the high-priests men who were not Sadducees. And Ryle and James argue for a Pharisaic priest as the author of the Psalms of Solomon.[3]

Allusion has already been made to the rival schools under Hillel and Shammai[4] which came into existence during the reign of Herod the Great and continued long after the death of their founders. And though only a brief reference can be made to them here, no picture of Pharisaism at this later period can be complete which does not take them into consideration. Hillel is usually described as the President and Shammai as the Vice-President of the Sanhedrin during Herod's reign. But as the Sanhedrin was almost powerless at this time some modification of this statement is obviously required. A. Büchler[5] argues for two Sanhedrin, one political and the other religious, and if this supposition were well founded it would be the latter

[1] Luke i. 6 ff.

[2] Hölscher shows that at least seven high-priests after the beginning of Herod's reign were not Sadducees; Josephus also mentions Jozarus and Ananus (*Life*, xxxix., xliv); cf. *Aboth*, ii. 10, iii. 2.

[3] For their argument see their ed. of Ps. Sol. lix.

[4] Supra, chap. ii. 5.

[5] *Das Synhedrion in Jerusalem.*

over which Hillel presided. Apart, however, from this uncertainty, there is no doubt about the activity of these two men or of the great influence they exerted. Hillel was 'a man of peace-loving disposition, of tender, humane sympathies, of genuine piety, of true humility; he stands forth a shining exemplar of the virtues which his religion consecrated.'[1] Shammai, on the other hand, 'was the redoubtable upholder of inherited custom, a relentless follower of the old beaten tracks, to depart from which was to call forth his measureless rage.'[2] Both were great interpreters of the Law, and pupils would pass from one to the other and make comparisons. Hillel was known for his mildness and Shammai for the severity of his demands. Rabbinic literature records 316 controversies in all between the two schools which they established, the Beth Hillel and the Beth Shammai, and of all these the latter took the more lenient view in no more than fifty-five cases.[3] So rare are they that the Mishnah prepares its readers for them by an introductory remark such as: 'The following are of the lenient views of Beth Shammai, and the stringent views of Beth Hillel.'[4] As will be seen when we come to discuss the Pharisees in their relations with Jesus, it is conjectured by some writers that it was the Shammaites with whom Jesus had His controversies. The Hillelites were men of a different and more genial temper, and, it is supposed, their attitude to the new teacher was likely to be less harsh and forbidding than that of the Pharisees mentioned in the Gospels. Happily for Judaism, the strife between the two schools ended in the triumph of the Hillelites. 'The Halakhah was fixed in accordance with the Hillelite view, and ratified by all subsequent Rabbinic codifiers.'[5]

Reference must be made to the *deep and genuine piety* of large numbers of Pharisees. Their faults of excessive legalism and censoriousness will come up for consideration in a later chapter, likewise their distinctive beliefs. But more important than either is the genuine religiousness which marked their life, and which is beyond question. Of this the Psalms of Solomon, despite all the bitterness they contain, provide

[1] E. G. Hirsch, art. 'Hillel,' *E. R. E.*, vi. 683.
[2] J. Abelson, art. 'Shammai,' *E. R. E.*, xi. 447.
[3] Ibid., p. 448. [4] Tract: *Eduyoth*, iv. 1. [5] J. Abelson, op. cit., 448.

abundant evidence.[1] A few quotations will best illustrate this :

Blessed is the man who is ready in his heart to call on the name of the Lord ;
When he maketh mention of the Lord's name, he shall be saved.
His ways are directed by the Lord,
And by the Lord his God are the works of his hands made secure.

. . . . . .

And the Lord hearkeneth to every one who prayeth in the fear of God,
Yea, the petition of a soul that hopeth in Him, the Lord fulfilleth.
Blessed be the Lord who showeth mercy unto those who love Him in sincerity !

. . . . . .

For Thou art gracious and merciful, the refuge of the poor.

. . . . . .

But they that fear the Lord shall rise again to life eternal,
In the light of the Lord shall be their life, nor shall it ever fail.

. . . . . .

He shall be cleansed, who prepareth his back for the scourge ;
For the Lord is gracious unto those who endure chastening patiently.

. . . . . .

Man's kindness is niggardly and done for a reward ;
Yea, if it be repeated without grudging, 'tis a wonder.
But Thy giving is ample, kindly and bountiful ;
Yea, whoso hopeth in Thee shall want for no gift.
Thy mercy spreads in kindness, Lord, o'er all the earth.

2. *The Sadducees.*—As shown in the preceding chapter, the Sadducees were the spiritual descendants of those Hellenizers, whose friendliness to the new spirit so greatly facilitated the diabolical attempt of Antiochus Epiphanes to reduce the entire nation to conformity to the prevailing movement. This does not imply, however, that either they or their successors intended to abandon their national faith, though they would probably have admitted that it signified a disposition towards a 'broad syncretism' in place of the rigid Judaism of their opponents. Originally the party consisted mainly of the high-priests and the nobility.

[1] See an art. on this subject by Moffatt, *Exp. T.*, xiii. 201 ff.
[2] Ps. Sol. vi. 1–3, 8, 9; v. 2; iii. 16; x. 2; v. 15–17.

How, then, did the party develop? The pre-Maccabean venture was an obvious failure, and ought to have ensured the complete disappearance of the party as such; but, as we have seen, their diplomacy and astuteness saved them, and after a period of judicious self-suppression, they quietly fell in behind the new Hasmonean rulers, and proceeded to realize their aims with more discretion and success than before.

Despite the great diversity of opinion on the course of their development, there are certain well-marked features in their subsequent history for which sufficient evidence is available and which give us a fairly clear idea of the party's aims and progress. These are: (*a*) their close association with the political movements of the time; (*b*) the exalted social position which they held in the community; (*c*) their frequent occupancy of the high-priesthood, and continuous devotion to the Temple; (*d*) the tenacity with which they clung to the Written Law (Torah) and rejected the authority of the Unwritten Law (Traditions of the Elders); and (*e*) a certain reputation for looseness in regard to the finer points of their religion. These we may now consider in order.

(*a*) It is evident that as a party the Sadducees were *strongly political*, and this has never been disputed. They were, throughout, strong and prominent supporters of the Hasmonean House, save only during the reign of Alexandra, and then they took the side of her son Aristobulus, who finally came to the throne. The execution of many of their leaders by Pompey (in 63 B.C.), and Herod (in 37 B.C.) is a further, if tragic, tribute to their influence, which even in opposition was too dangerous to be ignored. After the Romans took direct control of Judean affairs, their political proclivities found no further scope until the revolution broke out, and then they vainly endeavoured to stem the rising tide of fanaticism which their wider outlook showed them to be useless and self-destructive.

(*b*) The *high social position* of the Sadducees is equally unquestioned.[1] Josephus, from whom our information on this point chiefly comes, says that they influenced 'none but the rich, and have not the populace on their side'; 'their views are received by only a few, but those are of the highest rank.'[2] On the same authority we learn that 'to be of priestly extraction

[1] Geiger, Wellhausen, Schürer, and most recent writers are here in agreement.

[2] *Ant.*, XIII. X. 6; XVIII. i. 4.

is an indication of the splendour of a family,'[1] and as the post of high-priest was mostly in the possession of this sect, their social elevation is manifest. Similarly in the Sanhedrin, the highest Court of the nation, they were always predominant.[2] They formed, in fact, a small aristocracy, and it is probably on this account, as much as because of their religious attitude, that they failed to win the favour of the populace. An aristocratic party, whether religious or irreligious, has little chance of successful competition for the suffrages of the multitude if they hold themselves aloof from the people while their opponents mingle with them.

(*c*) There is little doubt that the *high-priesthood* was, under normal conditions, usually filled by a member of this party. During the lengthy period of the Hasmonean occupancy of the office, this rule may be said to have been broken, though in a sense the later Hasmoneans may be regarded as Sadduceans. Herod's arbitrary appointments must also be taken into account, but these are more likely to have been men of complacent Sadducean tendencies than of the robust Pharisaic type. Hölscher's conclusion, after careful scrutiny of the evidence, that seven occupants of the office were Pharisees,[3] still leaves seventeen at least to be accounted for from 37 B.C. onwards.[4] 'In the days of Roman rule,' says Schürer, 'they (i.e. the high-priests and the high-priestly families) were at the head of the Sanhedrin and of the native Government generally, and although the majority of them were unquestionably men of Sadducean tendencies, yet in the actual conduct of affairs they bowed, however reluctantly, to the wishes of the Pharisees.'[5] Hölscher is entirely opposed to this view. He declares that the Sadducees were not a party at all, but simply men who sympathized with Graeco-Roman culture and adopted a purely negative attitude towards the national religion. He admits that the high-priests and their entourage formed the Jerusalem aristocracy, and that Sadducees were to be found among them, but denies that they possessed such measure of solidity or cohesion as properly pertains to an organized party.[6] But to maintain this view he finds himself driven to the extreme course of treating the

[1] Josephus, *Life*, i.
[2] Acts iv. 1; v. 17; xxiii. 1 ff.
[3] *Der Sadduzäismus.*
[4] *Vide* Schürer, op. cit., II. i., 197 ff.
[5] Schürer, op. cit., II. i., 206.
[6] Op. cit., p. 13, and note.

whole evidence of the New Testament as falsified in an attempt to substitute the Sadducees for the Pharisees as the real opponents of Jesus. Probably few, if any, will follow him in such drastic criticism.

It must not be supposed, however, that the customary occupancy of the high-priesthood by the Sadducees implies that the priesthood as a whole was necessarily Sadducean.[1]

Apart from the embittered testimony of the Psalms of Solomon, there is no reason to doubt that the Sadducees discharged their Temple duties with fidelity and dignity. Had they failed in so important a matter we should have heard more of it, and especially in the pages of the New Testament.

(*d*) In their *religious outlook* the Sadducees were *conservative*, holding firmly to the recognized Torah (Written Law), together with a few ancient Oral Traditions contained in a 'Book of Decrees,' or 'Decisions,' but strenuously refusing the authority of those later accretions which the Pharisees had framed and now maintained.

As already stated, this characterization of the party is not accepted by some modern writers. But among older writers Krochmal and Geiger hold it, and more recently it has received the support of Kohler, Leszynsky, and Lauterbach. The last-named, indeed, alludes to what is a curious and almost contradictory contrast in each of the two parties. The Sadducees, who were, as Lauterbach believes, the upholders of the old and conservative elements of their Faith, were yet, strangely enough, determinedly opposed to the authority of Tradition; whereas the Pharisees, who were the younger, broader, more liberal and progressive school, relied for the most part on the dead hand of the Past.[2] Lauterbach has of course his own way of explaining this seeming paradox. We hardly think, however, that his description of the two parties is complete enough to be quite true. The Sadducees were certainly conservative in the matter of faith, but far from it in their general outlook on life. And it is no uncommon thing to find men whose religion is very intimately connected with the ritual of worship not merely indifferent, but actually opposed, to progressive thought, or to find men whose minds are active enough outside the sphere of religion, as was the case with the Sadducees, treating religion as something whose provisions are absolutely and

[1] *Vide* above, p. 63. [2] *Studies*, p. 179.

finally settled. In regard to the Pharisees, it is by no means certain that they were really broader and more liberal in spirit than their opponents, though they may have unwittingly accepted new views. But, however curious or contradictory the position, it is noteworthy that Lauterbach accepts it as a fact, which it is necessary to explain.

Segal's[1] contention that the Sadducees were actuated by exclusively political motives and used religion for political ends only, naturally leads him to reject the idea that they were the conservatives of the Jewish faith. His argument is based on such grounds as these: that when in power the Sadducees did not teach any views of their own; that the people in general were opposed to them; that they willingly accepted the upstart Hasmoneans as high-priests; and that they seized without justification the tithes from the threshing-floors (*Ant.*, xx. ix. 2; viii. 8). Canon Box has dealt with this argument in some detail in the pages of the Review[2] in which Segal's article appeared, and there is consequently little need to occupy much space here in showing its inconclusiveness. It may be pointed out, however, that as the Sadducees had none but the old views to teach, and being, according to our hypothesis, men of a conservative temperament and aristocrats as well, they were little likely to step down into the arena and contest the doctrines of their zealous opponents. That the people followed their Pharisaic leaders is true enough, and in the circumstances almost inevitable. The average Jew, like most average men, would be most likely to give heed to those who took the trouble to teach him, i.e. the Pharisees, especially when the teaching was supported by such marked earnestness and personal devotion. Again, though the Sadducees did accept the high-priesthood of the Hasmoneans, there is no ground for supposing that they did so 'willingly,' as Segal states. The last point Segal mentions certainly indicates a very serious lapse on the part of some Sadducees, but such an outrage is more reasonably attributed to a section of the party rather than to the party as a whole.

The witness of Josephus is clear enough. 'What I would now merely state is this, that the Pharisees have delivered to the people a great many traditional observances handed down from their fathers, which are not written in the Laws of

[1] *Expos.*, VIII. xiii., pp. 81–108. [2] *Expos.*, VIII. xv., 19 ff

Moses, and for that reason it is that the Sadducees reject them, and say that we are to esteem those observances obligatory that are in the Written Word, but are not to observe what are derived from the Tradition of our forefathers.'[1]

The same contrast between the Law of Moses and the Traditions is implied in the Gospel narratives, where the Pharisees are described as holding the 'tradition of the elders,'[2] otherwise the reason for the reference would be difficult to see. But in thus rejecting the newer interpretations and developments of their rivals, the Sadducees were only representing the older Jewish standpoint, as Schürer admits. Nor is it necessary to assume that in all cases their opposition signified disapproval of the particular demands made, but rather to their being placed on the same level of obligation as the Torah.[3] The latter was the Law of God, and had been accepted by their fathers in Ezra's time with solemn oath, and therefore possessed an entirely different authority from the prescriptions of men. In this they did not stand alone. For, as Oesterley points out,[4] though the Apocalyptists were devoted to the Law, it was more to the spirit than to the letter of it. And it is well known that Jesus was in this on the side of the Sadducees.[5] Oesterley goes so far as to say that the Sadducees were the real champions of the Law.[6]

Some writers, following Origen and Jerome, have charged the Sadducees with the rejection of all the Canonical Books of the Old Testament outside the Law, but for this there is not sufficient evidence. Perhaps the misconception has arisen, as C. Taylor[7] suggests, from the fact that Jesus, when arguing with the Sadducees, quotes from the Pentateuch when He might have based His reply more effectively on other parts of the Old Testament. But this choice is much more easily and reasonably explained by the consideration that the Sadducees, like all other Jews, placed the Pentateuch on a pedestal high above all other sacred literature, and thus their peculiar reverence for the Law only revealed their orthodoxy.

Kohler's conclusion that the Sadducees were 'the party representing views and practices of the law and interests of the

[1] *Ant.*, XIII. x. 6; cf. XVIII. i. 4.
[2] Mark vii. 3; Matt. xv. 2, &c.; cf. Gal. i. 14; Col. ii. 8.
[3] Both Schürer (op. cit., II. ii. 38), and Lauterbach (*Studies*, p. 185 ff.) agree in this.
[4] *Bks. Apoc.*, p. 99.
[5] Matt. v. 17–20; cf. Enoch v. 4; xcix. 2.
[6] Op. cit., p. 140.
[7] *Sayings of Jewish Fathers*, p. 114.

Temple priesthood directly opposite to those of the Pharisees,'[1] seems a correct inference from the facts.

(*e*) There remains the question of their *real attitude to religion*, already hinted at, but needing fuller consideration. Was it a mere adjunct—a necessary but burdensome and unwelcome adjunct—to their political and social ambitions? Were they mere worldlings who, because they found themselves in a religious atmosphere, and because it would aid their ambitions, deemed it politic to assume the outer forms of religion? Or was religion a genuine part of their lives, and only disparaged by the Pharisees because different from and less exacting than their own?

Schürer's view is 'that a certain amount of worldliness was the result of the superior position of the Sadducees. Their interests were entirely in this world, and they had no such intensive religious interest as the Pharisees.'[2]

In discussing their doctrinal views, Cowley assumes that 'a certain materialistic tendency would show itself, that practical politics would absorb attention to the exclusion of more contemplative pursuits,'[3] but the assumption of a 'materialistic tendency' on such grounds would challenge the religion of the majority of religious people in our own day, who are necessarily absorbed in secular affairs, but who are not therefore of necessity 'worldly.' Hölscher, of course, has gone much further. The Sadducees are 'the lax, the scoffers who make merry over the religious practice of the pious, as the infidels and godless,' and, in discussing their beliefs, declares that they denied every action of God in the world. Segal follows and even surpasses Hölscher in his derision of the Sadducean religion. After surveying the evidence, which to others seems sufficient to warrant an ascription of religiousness to the party, he pronounces it entirely unconvincing. We need not follow him in detail, but cite his conclusion: 'But the fact is . . . that the Sadducees were neither a sect, nor orthodox, nor even religious. They were really a set of men whose aim was chiefly, or entirely, political, and who were quite indifferent to the higher claims of religion or religious law.' 'The doctrines of the Sadducees were not orthodox; they were not even religious, but thoroughly irreligious.'[4]

[1] *J. E.*, art. 'Sadducees,' x., 630.
[2] Art. 'Sadducees,' *E. B.*, iv., 4,239 f.
[3] Op. cit., II. ii. 39.
[4] *Expos.*, VIII., xiii., 97.

Now the question at issue is not whether as a party the Sadducees were as religious as they ought to have been, nor even whether their religion was as intense and absorbing as that of the Pharisees. But, rather, whether their association with the Temple was really sincere, and, allowing for differences of view, they were men of conviction, and loyal to their conception of the demands of Jehovah.

(α) In the New Testament the Sadducees are compared and contrasted with the Pharisees on the ground of difference of religious views, and in every case their controversies and interests are of a religious character. Thus they join the Pharisees in an investigation into the ministry of John the Baptist; like their rivals they, too, had a 'leaven,' or teaching, against which Jesus warns His disciples; they questioned Jesus concerning the doctrine of the resurrection, endeavouring to show its absurdity, and thereby obtain a weapon against their opponents; it is further stated of them that they 'say that there is no resurrection, neither angel nor spirit.'[1] While therefore one may agree that they regarded the distinguishing views of their rivals with dislike, and even contempt, there is nothing in this to show that they were either indifferent or contemptuous towards religion as a whole, and as they themselves conceived it. To characterize them as irreligious on such grounds would assuredly do them a grave injustice.

(β) Josephus, himself a Pharisee and in no way biassed in favour of the Sadducees, only confirms this portrait of the New Testament. He reports quite frankly that they denied Fate and Immortality, future rewards and punishments, and, as the New Testament says, the resurrection. Also, that while accepting as authoritative the 'Written Word,' they would not admit the obligation of 'Tradition.' But nowhere does he throw doubt on their acceptance of the older doctrines of the Jewish faith. He certainly mentions and condemns their misconduct in raiding the threshing floors, just as on an earlier page he records the story of the Pharisees' vengeance in the reign of Alexandra Salome; and he likewise narrates with equal impartiality the divine favour shown to John Hyrcanus, who became a Sadducee, and praises the Sadducean high-priest Ananus, and Jesus, his colleague.[2]

[1] Matt. iii. 7; xvi. 1, 6, 11 f.; xxii. 23–33, and pars.; Acts iv. 2; xxiii. 8.
[2] *War*, II. viii. 14; IV. v. 2; *Ant.*, XIII. x. 6 f.; XVIII. i. 2; XX. ix. 1.

(γ) The evidence of the Mishna has been examined afresh by Eerdmans, Segal, and Box.[1] Many passages are cited in which the differences of interpretation and practice between the two parties are certainly very striking, but in every case the differences on the one side and on the other are entirely consistent with a serious attempt to explain and carry out religious principles. Schürer's suggestion that in these passages the Mishna is ironic is far from convincing. There is, in fact, more reason for Eerdmans' claim that the evidence of the Mishna goes to show that the Sadducees were in some matters even stricter than their rivals, and this agrees with the testimony of Josephus that they were known for 'severity' in judgement. Segal refuses to accept Eerdmans' conclusions, and even charges him with a total misconception of some of the passages under discussion. Though allowing that in the Roman period the Sadducees did 'concern themselves with religious controversy,' he nevertheless asserts that 'as controversialists they dealt in idle jests and cheap fun (cf. Yadajim iv.; Jerushalmi, Hagiga, iii. 5; Aboth d'Rabbi Nathan, v.; Matt. xxii. 23 ff.). Against this the Pharisees fought strenuously.'[2] On this indictment it is perhaps sufficient to remark that others find it quite possible to read the record of these controversies without discovering in them the spirit of which Segal complains. Even the passage in St. Matthew which is chosen as an illustration of 'cheap fun,' though it may reveal the Sadducees to be 'shallow' and 'erroneous,' as Segal alleges, does not imply irreligiousness, for the doctrine under consideration (the resurrection) was both novel and difficult to believers and unbelievers alike. Canon Box remains unconvinced by Segal, and quotes with approval Kohler, who says: 'Especially in regard to the Temple practice did they hold older views, based upon claims of greater sanctity for the priesthood, and of its sole dominion over the sanctuary.'[3] Both in the dispute over the daily burnt-offerings,[4] and the place at which the incense ought to be kindled,[5] Kohler holds that the views of the Sadducees were the older. Whatever else the Mishna proves, it is far from substantiating the charge of mere frivolous irreligiousness preferred against the Sadducees.

(δ) The recently discovered Zadokite Fragment, which is

[1] Arts. in *Expos.*, already cited. [2] Cf. *Expos.* VIII., xiii., 107.
[3] *J. E.*, x., 632. [4] Num. xxviii. 4. [5] Lev. xvi. 2.

regarded by most critics[1] as of Sadducean origin, goes far to confirm our thesis. For while this strange sect or sub-sect resembled the Pharisees in some matters, as, for instance, in their belief in a future life, angels and spirits, a certain amount of tradition, &c., they were opposed to the Pharisees and agreed with the Sadducees in attacking the traditionalists (' the builders of the wall,' who ' removed the landmark '), in regarding the Torah as the only Law Book, and in being more severe than the Pharisees in certain legal requirements (e.g. the Sabbath-Law). If, therefore, they represent only a ' reformed Sadduceeism,' as Charles contends, their name and origin are an evidence that their progenitors were not divorced from religion, as Segal and others contend.[2]

[1] So Schechter, Lévi, Leszynsky, Charles, and Margoliouth.
[2] *Apoc. and Pseud.*, ii., 790 f.

Chapter VI

DOCTRINES

Introductory

In dealing with the teaching of our two sects we wish to avoid two extremes. Merely to record the fact, with essential proofs, that on such subjects as the Law, the Messianic hope, eschatology, angels and spirits, free-will and Providence, the Pharisees and Sadducees were in opposite camps, even if the precise differences were indicated, would only leave the reader wondering. He would naturally ask why and when such opposition arose among men of the same religious faith. Some explanation is obviously called for which would act as a background, against which he might see and comprehend the well-known differences and how they had come to be. On the other hand, it would be unfair to attempt a summary of the beliefs of later Judaism, and simply place over against them the negatives of the Sadducees. This would suggest very strongly that the religion of the Sadducees consisted of negatives merely, whereas they may not unfairly be regarded as the official upholders of the national religion. Rather does it seem necessary to give such an account of the beliefs which had grown up in the two centuries preceding the advent of Jesus Christ, as may enable the reader to compare the new developments with the earlier faith of the legal and prophetic portions of the Old Testament. And if the result be that, instead of regarding the Sadducees as the cynics and sceptics of the New Testament, as is commonly done, he should find them in reality so devoted to the older faith as to be unable to accept the later innovations of the Pharisees, though he may feel himself embarrassed in the attempt to pass any decisive verdict on the two parties, he may have reached a truer idea of their respective merits.

Mention has already been made of the scantiness of Sadducean literature. Of books written by, or favourable to, the Pharisees we have a considerable number, but beyond Ecclesiasticus (or Sirach), which stands at the beginning of our period, and probably 1 Maccabees, we are left without witness to the Sadducean standpoint, save from the pens of their opponents. The Apocryphal and Apocalyptic writings, Josephus, the Talmud, and even, for the most part, the New Testament, all stand opposed to the views of the Sadducees. Whatever literature they produced fell into the hands of their victorious opponents, and, somehow, has not survived. Of course, there is the possibility that the Sadducees held themselves proudly aloof from controversy and did not defend themselves against the Pharisaic attacks, but it is in any case a great misfortune for the student that he can only see the Sadducees to-day through their opponents' eyes. He has therefore to be prepared for an unattractive and negative representation, without that relief which a positive and sympathetic statement might afford.

The background against which the doctrines of these two parties must be set will appear as we deal with the individual differences, but a general statement may be made here. The two last pre-Christian centuries, so far from being negligible in the matter of religious progress, as was formerly supposed, were among the most fruitful in the whole history of the nation. Great developments and modifications of Old Testament thought took place, and the beginning of this movement synchronized with the division of the nation into those tendencies which issued in the formation of our two parties. The cleavage was fateful for both parties and nation. The Sadducees were favourable to Hellenistic influence; the Pharisees, on the contrary, regarded it as a fatal menace to the nation and its faith. All that followed proceeded from this fundamental difference of view. In order to make their beliefs more effective, the Pharisees devoted themselves to the development of religious safeguards, and, with the professional Scribes leading the way, the legal demands and restrictions of their religion increased by leaps and bounds. This, indeed, became the one business of Pharisaism. The worship of the Temple was of necessity still observed, but a blight rested upon it, partly because of its desecration by Antiochus Epiphanes, and,

later, by Pompey, but mainly because the Temple was in charge of the Hasmoneans and the Sadducean high-priests.[1] The home of their religion was now much more the Synagogue than the Temple, and there they read and expounded the Old Law and its most recent developments.

Parallel with this legal development the Apocalyptic movement began its wonderful career, which lasted about three centuries. Some writers, as for example, Canon Charles, regard it as part of Pharisaic activity. But whether or not all Apocalyptists were definitely Pharisees, the movement was certainly the result of a kindred religious devotion and a fresh outburst of the prophetic instinct which had been so long suppressed. The Law was its background, and its hope for the future glory of the nation reposed on the faithful observance of its precepts.

The Sadducees held themselves aloof from both these movements. The Canon of the Law was for them finally closed, and no oral additions were to be expected or permitted. Similarly the Canon of the Prophets was now complete, and the strange anticipations of the Apocalyptists were unwelcome and not to be tolerated. Religious duties had been fixed, and, being divinely revealed, were not to be tampered with, either by addition or subtraction. Hellenism beckoned to them, Syncretism promised intellectual and other satisfactions without those wild Apocalyptic enthusiasms which were foredoomed to disappointment. They would therefore attempt the bold experiment of maintaining the Faith of their Fathers and the worship of the sacred Temple, while coquetting with the fascinating ideas of their overlords. Others might devise new ways and cherish fantastic and impossible expectations, but as for them, in the presence of disappointed hopes, they would fall back on philosophic calm and resignation, which were more congenial to their predispositions and ambitions.

Pharisaism was a progressive force, and, while eager to obtain and retain the favour of God by scrupulous obedience to the Old Law, was equally keen to adapt the demands of the ancient faith to the requirements of a new and complex age. Sadduceeism, on the other hand, was conservative, content to retain the faith of the past unimpaired, and seeing greater advantage in external adaptation to the Hellenistic spirit than in the intensification of Jewish exclusiveness. In this

[1] Cf. W. Douglas Mackenzie, *E. R. E.*, vii., 508, and Baldensp. *Selbstbew. Jesu*, 54 ff.

sense, therefore, it is true to say that the former party represents the positive elements in the religion of the time and the latter the negative.[1]

The doctrine of God is necessarily the supreme and regulative factor in a religious faith, but there is no good reason to suppose that the Pharisees and Sadducees differed materially on this subject. Undoubtedly the Pharisees held a high theory of the Theocracy, and this led them to resent very bitterly all foreign interference with their religion. So much so that, when their own princes took upon themselves the office of high-priest, and as the holders of this sacred office became involved in treaties and wars after the manner of the Gentiles, the contamination utterly estranged them. The development in the idea of God was doubtless the work of both Legalists and Apocalyptists, the Sadducees, for all we know to the contrary, being content to follow in their wake. Its chief characteristic was that God came to be regarded as abstract and transcendental, and one recognizes the beginning of this change in the attempt of the Greek translators of the Old Testament to remove all the anthropomorphisms of the Hebrew text. The influences which brought it about may be found partly in the new Hellenistic spirit, the refinement induced by the presence of other religious beliefs, and, probably, the greater care with which the Scribes now carried on their Old Testament researches. 'It may truly be said to pervade all forms of late Judaism, but nowhere does it come to clearer expression than in Apocalyptic. God is supreme over the world. He dwells at an inaccessible height, and is surrounded with an impassable barrier of fiery glory.'[2] God was the Creator and is to be the Judge; meanwhile He is the distant ruler of the world. How this conception facilitated the growth of a belief in such intermediaries as angels will be seen later, but it will be obvious that it was also calculated to impose on the people the most careful and rigid observance of the divine commands.

I. Law and Tradition.—The 'Law' was the Written Law found in the Pentateuch. 'Tradition' refers to the vast mass of oral explanations, modifications, and additions, by means of which the Scribes and Pharisees sought to adapt the Old Law to the requirements of the new age, and so secure exact and

[1] So Cowley, Hölscher, Lauterbach, and others.
[2] Box, art. 'Jewish Apocal. in Apost. Age,' *Expos.*, VIII., XXIV., p. 437.

minute obedience to the will of God. Both Pharisees and Sadducees held to the 'Law.' But while the Pharisees made 'Tradition' equally as binding as the Written Law, the Sadducees placed it in a subordinate position. Most writers would go farther and assert that the Sadducees rejected Tradition altogether, but this is, as we shall see, an overstatement.

Our most reliable witnesses on the point are Josephus and the New Testament. Josephus tells us 'that the Pharisees have delivered to the people a great many traditional observances handed down from their fathers, which are not written in the Laws of Moses, and for that reason it is that the Sadducees reject them, and say that we are to esteem those observances obligatory that are in the Written Word, but are not to observe what are derived from the tradition of our forefathers. And great disputes and differences have arisen concerning these things among them . . .'[1] Elsewhere the same writer informs us that Queen Alexandra Salome (78–69 B.C.) 'restored those practices which the Pharisees had introduced, according to the traditions of their forefathers, and which her father-in-law Hyrcanus had abrogated.'[2] In the New Testament we have such well-known passages as: 'For the Pharisees, and all the Jews, except they wash their hands diligently, eat not, holding the tradition of the elders.'[3]

The great place occupied by 'Tradition' being clear, we should next observe that it gradually assumed so commanding a position among the Legalists that in effect it actually became superior to the Written Law. This is one of the charges brought against them by Jesus: 'making void the Word of God by your tradition, which ye have delivered: and many such like things ye do'; 'Ye leave the commandment of God and hold fast the tradition of men.'[4] So, too, in one of the Tractates of the Mishnah we are plainly told: 'It is more culpable to teach contrary to the precepts of the Scribes than contrary to the Torah itself.'[5] And not only were the Scribes' interpretations of the Written Law authoritative, but their fresh enactments were equally binding, even if they should seem contrary to the Torah itself. 'The sword comes upon the world for suppression of justice and for perversion of

[1] *Ant.*, XIII. x. 6. [2] *Ant.*, XIII. xvi. 2.
[3] Mark vii. 3; cf. vv. 5, 8, 9, 13; Matt. xv. 2, 3, 6; Gal. i. 14.
[4] Mark vii. 13, 8. [5] *Sanhedrin*, xi., 3.

justice, and for those that teach in the Torah not according to Rule' (i.e. Halachah, part of the Tradition).[1]

Some measure of development was doubtless requisite to meet new circumstances and men's religious needs, and a closed Canon of Law had obvious embarrassments. Changes were therefore introduced in such important matters as Sabbath observance, Temple worship, prayers, the Day of Atonement, and Feasts and Festivals. These were authorized and taught by the Scribes, and practised and enforced by the Pharisees. To attempt even a summary of this vast mass of legal demands, even if it were possible, would take us too far beyond our present aim, but the reader of the New Testament has little difficulty in observing how vast is the range they cover.

Where, then, did the high-priestly party stand in relation to all this legal development? Josephus, already quoted, does not charge them with neglect of the Written Law, only of the 'great many traditional observances handed down from their fathers,' and, indeed, the mere omission of such a charge does less than justice to the devotion of the Sadducean sect to the Law. Of this there is ample evidence; when Pompey was engaged in attacking Jerusalem (63 B.C.), he was permitted by the defenders to throw up a bank against it without molestation, because he did it on the Sabbath. For, while the old Sabbath Law allowed the Jews to defend themselves when actually attacked, it forbade active defence against what was only preparation for attack. And this incident occurred when the Sadducean party was in power under Aristobulus II.[2] The First Book of Maccabees, probably a Sadducean production, gives other instances of this fidelity, and shows with what reluctance the Sabbath Law was laid aside even to save the people from extinction.[3] Further, the disputes between Pharisees and Sadducees recorded in the Talmud are all on points of law, but always on difficulties of interpretation, never on the obligation to obey the Law when correctly understood. The opinion of an orthodox modern Jewish writer confirms this: 'The Sadducees were probably not lacking in devotion to the Torah; their observance was perhaps less extensive, but not less fervent. They rejected the *s'yagh*, or fence, which the Pharisees erected. They did not insist so strongly and

[1] *Pirke Aboth.*, v, 11. [2] *Ant.*, xiv. iv. 2.
[3] Cf. I. Macc. ii. 1–28; iii. 21, 29; vi. 59; ii. 32–41.

frequently as the Pharisees on the necessity for observing the Law, because this was taken for granted.'[1] We may therefore dismiss without hesitation the idea that the Sadducees were lax in their observance of the Torah.

Moreover, it is a mistake to suppose that they were opposed to *all* unwritten laws or traditions. Probably these began to take form soon after Ezra, and they would tend to increase generation after generation to keep pace with changing needs. And the high-priest would be the official custodian of them. One may hazard the conjecture that this process continued uninterruptedly up to the time when the nation was rent in twain by the dispute about Hellenism. This view, so strangely overlooked by some recent writers, was maintained long ago by Kuenen, who says: 'They acknowledged the authority of the Law without any reservation. Nor did they reject the Oral Tradition, in so far as this was already established when they constituted themselves a party.'[2] The Sadducees indeed held strongly that new requirements could only be sanctioned by the ecclesiastical authority, and for this belief had the warrant of the Written Law. Thus, 'If there arise a matter too hard for thee in judgement . . . thou shalt come unto the priests the Levites, and unto the judge that there shall be in those days: and thou shalt inquire; and they shall show the sentence of judgement; and thou shalt do according to the tenor of the sentence,' &c.[3] It was partly, therefore, because the Pharisees and their scribes had, as the Sadducees believed, usurped the functions of the high-priesthood that they rejected the later accretions. But it is probable that the high-priestly party had traditions of their own. Lauterbach cites a passage found in the Mishnaic Tractate Meg: Taanith, reporting the abrogation by the later victorious Pharisees of the volume called the 'Book of Decrees,' or 'Decisions,' which contained the traditions of the Sadducees.[4] It was not therefore that the Sadducees objected altogether to the accumulation and use of traditions, assuming that they were properly authorized, but rather to that vast mass of traditions which had been originated and authorized in an irregular and excessive way by the Pharisaic scribes alone.

[1] Loewe, *E. R. E.*, vii., 590, art. 'Judaism.'
[2] *Rel. Isr.*, iii., 144; cf. Schürer, op. cit., II. ii. 38. [3] Deut. xvii. 8 ff.
[4] *Studies*, p. 186, and note.

But there was still another and most important point of divergence. Whatever the source of Tradition, the Sadducees insisted that it did not and could not stand on a level of equality with the Torah itself. The latter had been accepted, generations ago, by the people on oath. It was therefore absolutely binding. 'Tradition' was in an entirely different position. It had grown up out of the varying interpretations of men, had been at first often hotly disputed, and, however valuable, had never been accepted by the people as a body after the manner of the Written Law. And consequently they were not under any *obligation* to obey it. This attitude goes far to explain the Sadducees' reputation for permitting the exercise of private opinion and disputation with their own leaders. From their standpoint this was obviously neither flippant nor unreasonable. Further, the Sadducees always maintained that new enactments should be based on and deduced from the Torah, otherwise, in their judgement, they contained no binding force. In the sequel, though the Sadducees disappeared as a party after A.D. 70, they won their case on this point. For the Pharisees found it necessary at last to accept the principle that all changes and developments in the Law must be justified and proven by an appeal to the Torah. 'The Pharisees had conquered . . . but they had only conquered by appropriating the principle of the enemy. From the party of tradition arose the party of the Torah as traditionally conceived. Rabbinical Judaism is in truth a synthesis of Pharisaism and Sadduceeism.'[1]

To New Testament students it is a matter of deep interest to know whether Jesus expressed by word or attitude His position on this dispute between the two parties. Probably they are prepared to find that He ignored it in the main, as being outside His province. On the other hand, it is claimed by Leszynsky that He was definitely on the side of the Sadducees. As an illustration of this he cites the dispute about the necessity of washing the hands before meals insisted on by the Pharisees and their scribes, and the adverse comment of Jesus, which concludes thus: 'Making void the Word of God by your tradition, which ye have delivered: and many such like things ye do.'[2] To this Leszynsky appends the remark: 'This sounds as precise as if a Sadducee had copied it, it is the genuine

[1] **Leszynsky**, *Die Sadduzäer*, p. 141. [2] Mark vii. 5 ff.; Matt. xv. 1; Luke x. 38.

Sadducean doctrine: the Torah, the command of God, is recognized, but the additions made by men are rejected, among them especially the prescriptions regarding purity.' He also points out that healing the sick on the Sabbath, so strongly objected to by the Pharisees, was not forbidden in the Torah. It was merely another prohibition of the Pharisees. Likewise, on the subject of divorce, Jesus again follows the Sadducees.[1] All this seems to be incontrovertible. Without anticipating what must be said on this subject at a later stage, it may be suggested that Jesus belonged to neither side wholly; but that where the traditional regulations seemed to hinder or fetter the true expression of the religious life He ignored them; and that, as the most objectionable restrictions were Pharisaic in origin, He leaned not infrequently to the views of the Sadducees, though His reasons for doing so were different from theirs.

II. The Messianic Hope.—It is a somewhat striking fact that, though a vast literature has grown up on this subject, the majority of scholars ignore any question of differences of view between our two parties. The underlying assumption is not far to seek, it being commonly supposed that the Sadducees entertained no Messianic hope of any kind whatsoever. Thus Schürer,[2] Cowley,[3] and Mitchell,[4] in treating of the Sadducees, do not raise the point at all. Even the New Testament leaves the question untouched. Some writers state quite frankly what others have indicated tacitly. Thus D. Eaton says: 'Naturally the Sadducees were wholly indifferent to such Messianic expectations';[5] and A. T. Robertson is of the same opinion: 'But at least it can be said at once that they (i.e. the Pharisees) revived and preserved belief in the Messiah, however mistaken their idea of him was. The Sadducees expected no Messiah.'[6]

Leszynsky, however, in his volume on the Sadducees[7] expresses an entirely different opinion, and attempts to show not only that there was a Sadducean doctrine of the Messiah, but that on one point a distinct divergence of view existed between the two parties. The Pharisees looked for a Messiah from the house of David, i.e. the tribe of Judah, whereas the

[1] Op. cit., p. 286 f., 291, 293 ff.
[2] *E. B.*, art. 'Sadducees.'
[3] *H. D. B.*, art. 'Pharisees.'
[4] *J. P. T. J. C.*, II. ii. 29–43.
[5] *D. C. G.*, art. 'Sadducees.'
[6] *The Pharisees and Jesus*, p. 40.
[7] *Die Sadduzäer*, p. 94 ff.

Sadducees expected him from the tribe of Levi, i.e. from the priestly line. Both Box and Oesterley quote and support this view, and it is therefore desirable to give an outline of Leszynsky's argument.

The Pharisees, adhering as was their wont to the traditions of the Elders, believed that the Kingdom of David would be everlasting, and that from the seed of David the Messiah would at last spring, as Isaiah, Jeremiah, and Ezekiel had promised. The Sadducees, on the other hand, drew all their conclusions from the Torah. In the Pentateuch God's chosen ones were Aaron and his seed; Jehovah had made an eternal covenant with Aaron's grandson, Phinehas; and Ezekiel, in keeping with this, regarded the sons of Zadok as Israel's future leaders[1]; consequently, the Messiah would be of priestly blood. As against this argument the Pharisees might, of course, refer to the well-known passage in Genesis: 'The sceptre shall not depart from Judah, nor the ruler's staff from between his feet until Shiloh come,' &c.[2]; but the Sadducees were able to counter it by citing the case of the priest-king Melchizedek.[3] Psalm cx. was written to vindicate the position of the Maccabean priest-king Simon (though this is disputed by C. A. Briggs).[4] Its ascription to David was probably the work of the Pharisees. From the same quarter came Psalms lxxxix. and cxxxii., written as a Pharisaic counterblast to the Sadducean view.[5] But the strongest evidence in favour of the Sadducean claim, according to Leszynsky, is the passage: 'And ye shall be unto me a kingdom of priests and a holy nation.'[6] Here the priests, not a family out of Judah, are the kings. That the Sadducees actually used this verse as an argument is amply shown by the way in which the ancient versions seek to get rid of its implication by separating 'kings' from 'priests.'[7] Even the Apocalypse of John, 2 Maccabees, and the *Ethiopic Jubilees*,[8] show the activity of this opposition. The Sadducees, on the contrary, could maintain with full right that according to the law the kingdom appertained to the priests. In a

[1] Ezek. xliv. 15 ff.
[2] Gen. xlix. 10.
[3] Gen. xiv. 18 ff.
[4] *Com. Ps. I. C. C.*, ad loc.
[5] Leszynsky, op. cit., p. 95, note.
[6] Exod. xix. 6.
[7] The LXX has βασίλειον ἱεράτευμα, a royalty, a priesthood; *vide Bab. and Pal. Targums*. Also vide Charles's *Jubilees*, p. 116, for full list of passages, to which 2 Macc. ii. 17 should be added; cf. *Apoc. and Pseud.*, ii, p. 38.
[8] Rev. v. 10, cf. i. 6; 2 Macc. ii. 17; *Jub.*, xvi. 18; cf. xxxiii. 20.

footnote, Leszynsky adduces the 'Zadokite Fragment' and 'The Testaments' as supporting the view of the Sadducees. Josephus and the Mishnah are negligible; probably the former had not the courage to mention any hope of a Messiah to his Greek and Roman readers; the Emperor Vespasian stood for all the Messiah he looked for.

Such is Leszynsky's argument. Box, who seems to accept it, remarks, 'We have already seen that the Sadducees rejected the Messianic doctrine of the Pharisees which looked for a Davidic Messiah, because they considered that the prophetic teaching on this subject was in conflict with that of the Torah.'[1] Oesterley states Leszynsky's thesis and develops it by adding corroborative evidence from Sirach and the Zadokite Fragment.[2] Eerdmans, without proclaiming his adhesion to Leszynsky's view on this particular point, breaks away from the usual idea that the Sadducees did not look for a Messiah.[3] Emmet, while recognizing that some expected the Messiah from the tribe of Levi, briefly indicates disagreement with Leszynsky's conclusion: 'We have not sufficient material to justify us in regarding this as a specifically Sadducean conception as opposed to a Pharisaic Messiah ben David.'[4]

1. Now there can be no doubt that in the Greek period Jewish literature reveals a considerable waning of the hope, encouraged by the earlier prophets, that a national deliverer would spring from the House of David. In the many difficulties through which the nation had passed there had been no sign of any hero from that quarter, and, naturally enough, expectation gradually declined. Moreover, as Bousset[5] points out, the conquests of Alexander had introduced the Jew into a much larger world of life and culture, and his widened political and intellectual horizons made the figure of a Davidic-Messianic King seem somewhat incongruous. It is not surprising, therefore, that in quite a number of writings of this later period such a hero is wanting, as, e.g. in Joel, Isaiah xxiv.–xxvii., Sirach, Daniel, Enoch, i.–xxxvi., and Jubilees. And even where he is mentioned, as in Enoch lxxxv.–xc., 'he holds a secondary position, and is far more shadow than substance.'

2. It is also indisputable that for a considerable time, notably during the ascendancy of the Maccabean prince-priests, the

[1] *E. R. E.*, xi, 45a. [2] *Bks. of Apoc.*, p. 148 ff. [3] *Expos.*, VIII. viii. 299–315
[4] *E. R. E.*, viii. 577, n. [5] *Relig. des Judenthums*, p. 255 f. 2nd ed.)

minds of many did not content themselves with disparaging the House of David, but turned to the possibility of a Messiah from the House of Levi, whom the Maccabeans represented. And as it was just then that the cleavage between the Sadducean party and the Pharisees showed itself, it was quite natural that the former should re-examine the ancient and universally acknowledged Torah with the object of justifying their claim, in the manner suggested by Leszynsky. In support of this changed attitude, Oesterley[1] draws attention to a striking passage in Sirach. Here Phinehas, Aaron's grandson, is placed alongside of Moses and Aaron as 'the third in glory.' David is also named, but while his inheritance 'is his son's alone,' that of Aaron is 'to him and to his seed.'[2] 'A differentiation is thus made between the royal line and the priestly line' in favour of the latter. Possibly Psalm cx. is to be taken as further evidence of the same movement, as Leszynsky, Duhm, Bickell, and others contend. Of the strength of this idea the 'Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs' gives abundant evidence. This is a document which Canon Charles dates between 109 and 106 B.C., at a time, that is, when John Hyrcanus was still in friendly association with the Pharisees, and is ascribed by them to a Pharisee of the earliest type, i.e. a Chasid. Leszynsky[3] and Oesterley[4] doubt this Pharisaic origin, and the latter, especially, argues for a Sadducean groundwork followed by revision and interpolations by a Pharisee. In either case, the book makes it sufficiently clear that the hopes of men were looking in the direction of the tribe of Levi. 'In the original work the Messiah is to be descended from Levi, and not from Judah—in other words, he is to be first of all a priest, and then a prophet and king. There are many passages expressing this view: T. Reub. vi. 7–12; T. Lev. viii. 14, xviii.; T. Jud. xxiv. 1–3; T. Dan. v. 10, 11; T. Jos. xix. 5–9. We have here the attestation of a most remarkable revolution in the Jewish expectations of the Messiah. For some thirty or forty years the hope of a Messiah from Judah was abandoned in favour of a Messiah from Levi.'[5] A single quotation will serve to show the general tenor of this hope: 'To Levi God gave the sovereignty. . . . Therefore, I command you to hearken to Levi, because he shall know the law of the Lord and shall

[1] *Bks. of Apoc.*, 149, n.; also *Coms.*, ad loc. [2] Ecclus. xiv. 23–25.
[3] Op. cit., 239 ff. [4] Op. cit., 210 ff. [5] Charles, *Tests. Patr.*, xcvii.

give ordinances for judgement . . . he shall bless Israel and Judah, because him hath the Lord chosen to be King over all the nation. And bow down before his seed, for on our behalf it will die in wars visible and invisible, and will be among you an eternal King.'[1] The later interpolations in the book, in the interest of the House of Judah, are too obvious to be missed, and only serve to make the original author's position the more striking.

3. But as the Maccabean prince-priests flattered only to deceive, the minds of many earnest Jews quickly abandoned the new-born hope in Levi, and, having no other resource, swung back again to Judah and David. The Pharisees had always resented, on other grounds, the union of the office of high-priest and king, as John Hyrcanus and Alexander Jannaeus knew to their cost,[2] but hitherto had been unable to prevent it. Now, the failure of the Maccabeans gave them their opportunity. Thus even in the 'Testaments of the Patriarchs,' presumably in an interpolation, we find the Patriarch Judah saying to his sons: 'Then shall the sceptre of my kingdom shine forth; and from your root shall arise a stem; and from it shall grow a rod of righteousness to the Gentiles, to judge and save all that call upon the Lord.'[3] But the so-called 'Psalms of Solomon'[4] are the most outstanding witness to this reversion to the old hope. 'Behold, O Lord,' cries the Pharisaic Psalmist, 'and raise up unto them their king, the son of David, at the time in the which Thou seest, O God, that he may reign over Israel Thy servant.'[5] The situation is well stated by J. Viteau: 'Since Haggai and the Babylonian captivity the Messianism of the House of David had been lost from view, forgotten even, especially since the establishment of the triumphant Kingdom of the Hasmoneans. In 1 Macc. ii. 57 one reads: "David, for being merciful, inherited the throne of a kingdom for ever and ever." This is, we believe, the only passage in the Scriptures, subsequent to the return to Jerusalem, in which mention is made of the perpetual kingdom of David. Our author needed a robust faith and courage to proclaim this forgotten kingdom and to pray God for its prompt re-establishment in place of the Hasmonean dynasty which had seized the throne.'[6]

[1] T. Reub. vi. 7–12. [2] *Ant.*, xiii. xi. 1, xv. 5. [3] T. Jud. xxiv. 5 f.
[4] Date 70–40 B.C. [5] Ps. Sol., xvii. 23; cf. xvii. 5, 8.
[6] *Les Psaumes de Salomon*, p. 69.

4. But not all returned to the hope in David. Possibly the majority of the Pharisees did so, and the majority of the ordinary people likewise ; witness certain passages in the New Testament, e.g. Mark xi. 10 ; Matt. ix. 27, xii. 23, xv. 22, and parallels ; and in the genealogies of Mark and Luke, Jesus is traced back to David. The Sadducees, however, appear to have remained strong in the conviction that the dynasty of David was dead, and would know no resurrection. This is what we should have surmised, but the recently discovered ' Zadokite Fragment ' removes all doubt on the point. Canon Charles regards the Fragment as descriptive of some reformed Sadducees ; it was written certainly before A.D. 70 and possibly between 18 and 8 B.C. Perhaps its most remarkable feature is its references to the Messiah who is expected to arise from ' Aaron and Israel.'[1] Whether or not one is able to accept the striking suggestion of Charles, who finds the solution of this mysterious expectation in a son of Mariamne and Herod, the former as representing ' Aaron,' and the latter as representing ' Israel,' it is impossible to deny the deliberate neglect of Judah in these references or the equally deliberate substitution of Levi (or Aaron).

5. Gathering together these facts, then, we are led to this conclusion : During the Greek period, and up to the time of the Maccabees, the older expectation of a Messiah from David had nearly died away, due on the one hand to unfulfilled hope, and on the other hand to the ambitions of the high-priesthood. This change was greatly strengthened when the victorious Maccabean rulers assumed the high-priesthood. Their growing association with the Sadducees led this party to feel that their earlier supposition respecting Levi was entirely justified, while the Pharisees were, if unwillingly, perforce bound to bow for a time before the Hasmoneans' success. In the first century B.C. came the abject failure of the Hasmoneans, and the consequent quick and eager reaction on the part of the Pharisees and the people, whose reversion to the Davidic hope is beyond dispute. What its effect was on the Sadducees we are at first left to conjecture, but, if the ' Zadokite Fragment ' may be treated as representative, it is evident that they still resisted the Davidic expectation and clung obstinately to ' Levi,' though in a modified form.

[1] Zad. Frag., ix. 10, 29 b ; xv. 4a.

III. ESCHATOLOGY.—Eschatology of course includes immortality, resurrection, and retribution. On one or more of these matters we are fortunate to possess precise statements in two important sources, viz. the New Testament and Josephus, and it will be an advantage to set out their testimony at the outset.

New Testament. The information is certainly very limited here, but quite clear so far as it goes. In Mark we are told; 'And there came unto Him Sadducees which say there is no resurrection.'[1] The writer of the Acts reveals the anxiety of the Sadducees lest men should be led to believe in the resurrection of Jesus, probably because they feared trouble with the Romans: 'And as they (the apostles) spake unto the people, the priests and the captain of the Temple and the Sadducees came upon them, being sore troubled because they taught the people and proclaimed in Jesus the resurrection from the dead.'[2] Later in his book the same writer mentions the matter again, and this time places the beliefs of the Pharisees over against those of the Sadducees: 'For the Sadducees say that there is no resurrection, neither angel nor spirit; but the Pharisees confess both.'[3] Thus far the New Testament, and it should be noted that though the resurrection is named as maintained by the Pharisees and rejected by the Sadducees, no mention is made of immortality or retribution.

Josephus. This writer has two passages which have had an important bearing on the common view concerning Sadducean beliefs, and therefore demand close attention: '. . . the Pharisees . . . think also that all souls are immortal, but that the souls of good men are removed into other bodies, while the souls of bad men are punished with eternal punishment. But the Sadducees . . . take away belief in the immortality of the soul and in punishments and rewards in Hades.'[4] '. . . the Pharisees also believe that souls have an immortal power in them, and that there will be under the earth rewards and punishments according as men have lived virtuously or viciously in this life; and the latter souls are to be detained in an everlasting prison, but the former will have power to live again. . . . But the doctrine of the Sadducees is that souls

[1] Mark xii. 18; cf. Matt. xxii. 23, and Luke xx. 27.
[2] Acts iv. 1 f.
[3] Acts xxiii. 8.
[4] *War*, II. viii. 14.

die with the bodies.'[1] For purpose of comparison we may add the same writer's statement of the belief of the Essenes on this subject: 'The Essenes . . . teach the immortality of souls and think that the rewards of righteousness are to be earnestly striven for.'[2] Even a cursory examination of these passages shows that we have here a considerable advance on the slight statements in the New Testament. The Pharisees are reported to hold all three doctrines placed at the head of this section: immortality, resurrection, and retribution, and the Sadducees to reject them all. But a further fact emerges in regard to the resurrection. In the *War* good men's souls 'are removed into other bodies,' whereas in the *Antiquities* this allusion is dropped, and we are told simply that 'souls have an immortal power in them.' We shall return to this variation at a later stage.

The Mishnah.—As might be expected, the Mishnah upholds in general the belief of the Pharisees, which had by then become the common property of Judaism. One passage will suffice: '. . . he who says that the resurrection of the dead is not to be inferred from the Law has no part in the world to come.'[3] The chief value of this remark lies in the fact that even the Law has now come to be regarded as containing by inference the doctrine of the resurrection.

Now, if the only question before us were that of the resurrection of the dead, the matter would be clear enough, for according to all available testimony, while the Pharisees accepted this doctrine, the Sadducees rejected it. But that the Sadducees rejected also the belief in immortality is by no means so certain, and a brief survey of later Jewish literature will enable us to see how the matter stood.

The general attitude of Old Testament writers to the Future Life is very vague and uncertain. The unit is not the individual but the nation, the teaching of writers like Ezekiel taking a long time to fructify, and the future of the nation being closely bound up with the expected Messianic kingdom, itself but dimly perceived. When a man died he passed into Sheol, a place or state which was probably not under the control of Jehovah. 'Sheol was the scene of a shadowy life that faintly reflected the realities of the upper world, and there accordingly not moral but social distinctions were observed, and a man

[1] *Ant.*, XVIII. i. 3, 4. [2] *Ant.*, XVIII. i. 5. [3] *Sanhedrin*, X. 1.

held among the shades a position corresponding to the social position he had enjoyed in his earthly life.'[1] 'The eschatology of the prophets dealt only with the destiny of Israel as a nation, and the destinies of the Gentile nations, but it had no message of light or comfort for the individual beyond the grave. For all men ultimately, whether of Israel or the Gentiles, Sheol, the unblessed abode of the shades, was the final and everlasting habitation.'[2] Even the passage quoted by Jesus from Exodus iii. 6, 'I am the God of Abraham, and the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob,' had apparently brought little illumination to Old Testament writers themselves, still less His deduction: 'He is not the God of the dead, but of the living.'[3]

The dawn of new ideas is to be found in Job, a late section of Isaiah, and Daniel. For the most part the post-exilic writer of Job sees no hope for a man after he is dead; there remains only Sheol for him[4]; and the famous passage in xix. 26 f. ('I know that my redeemer liveth, &c.') undoubtedly meant much less to the speaker than to us who are accustomed to connect it with Jesus Christ. Dr. Peake, for instance, paraphrases the words thus: 'I know that my Vindicator even now lives, and after I am dead will rise up to attest my righteousness, and though my body is destroyed, yet I shall see God acting thus for me.'[5] Budde and Kautzsch do not go even so far as this, arguing that the vindication is to take place before, not after, the speaker's death. In either case nothing of definite importance can be deduced in regard to the life beyond.

We reach something much more certain in Isaiah xxvi. 19, a passage which belongs to the late post-exilic period, not earlier than the middle of the fourth century B.C. Following the translation of Duhm and Cheyne, it reads: 'Thy dead men (Israel) shall arise: the inhabitants of the dust shall awake and shout for joy; for a dew of lights is thy dew, and the earth shall bring to life the shades.' This is a confident expectation of a resurrection—a resurrection, that is, of the righteous. With this prophecy may be compared Psalms xlix and lxxiii.

[1] Charles, *Between Old and New Testaments*, p. 100 f. [2] Ibid., p. 18 f.
[3] Mark xii. 26 f. [4] E.g. Job vii. 9 f.; xiv. 7 ff.
[5] *Cent. B. Com. on Job.* ad loc.

Daniel xii. 2 marks a still greater advance, the wicked being now included in the resurrection along with the righteous: 'And many of them that sleep in the dust of the earth shall awake, some to everlasting life, and some to shame and everlasting contempt.' It must be noted, however, that Daniel was written between 167 and 165 B.C., and therefore after the cleavage between the Hellenists and the Chasidim had begun; consequently it is safer to regard it more as an individual view than as one held by the whole community. Moreover, the book is one of the most outstanding examples in the Old Testament of that Apocalyptic literature which was to play so conspicuous a part during the next two or three centuries, but which was always ignored by the Sadducees, and which even the Pharisees regarded with distrust. In fact, as we shall see presently, it was in these prolific Apocalyptic writings that Eschatology now began to develop with such long and rapid strides. But before examining these it may be well to make it quite clear that the views quoted from Isaiah and Daniel were exceptional, and that the ordinary view of the future was still without hope or light.

The *Book of Ecclesiasticus* (or *Sirach*) which, though not exactly a Sadducean production, is generally regarded as representing the Sadducean point of view, and possibly for that reason omitted from the Canon, is just slightly earlier (*circa* 180 B.C.) in date than Daniel, but it does not share this writer's hope in regard to the dead. The following may be taken as expressing the characteristic attitude of this writer, and is also in keeping with the general tenor of the Psalms.[1]

For what pleasure hath God in all that perish in Hades,
In place of those who live and give Him praise?
Thanksgiving perisheth from the dead as from one that is not,
(But) he that liveth and is in health praiseth the Lord.[2]

The only sense in which the dead can live is in the immortality of 'righteous dead.'

Their bodies were buried in peace,
But their name liveth unto all generations.[3]

[1] Cf. e.g. Ps. vi. 5.

[2] Ecclus. xvii. 27 f.; cf. xviii. 8–11; xxii. 11.

[3] Ecclus. xliv. 14.

Ecclesiastes, which also belongs in all probability to the first quarter of the second century B.C. (so Barton, Peake, and others), is equally without hope: 'The dead know not anything, neither have they any more a reward; for the memory of them is forgotten.'[1] Expressed pessimistically perhaps, this was nevertheless the common view at this time, and it is to be borne in mind that Ecclesiastes was sufficiently orthodox to be admitted into the Canon!

The change of view came with the Apocalyptists, inspired doubtless by 'Daniel.' Urged by their profound belief in the divine benignity and justice to hold that the faithful and righteous must be approved by the Most High, and yet convinced by the terrible misfortunes of the period that they were receiving no proportionate reward in this life, the Apocalyptists began to look forward in confident anticipation to rewards and punishments beyond the grave. But it was not the more favourably placed Sadducees who felt this moral impetus. Nor, speaking of them as a party, did it originate among the Pharisees. It was rather part of the new Messianic hope, a movement which was mainly prevalent among the people themselves, and the spirit of which permeated the Apocalyptic literature. In the Book of Enoch the resurrection is plainly, if variously, anticipated. In chaps. i.–xxxvi.,[2] the resurrection to the final judgement 'seems to be limited to Israel and its progenitors.' A later section, chaps. lxxxiii.–xc.[3] 'teaches the resurrection of the righteous only.' Chaps. xxxvii.–lxx.[4] look for the resurrection of all Israel from the dead; the judgement awaits all the angels, fallen and unfallen, the righteous and sinners among men, including kings and other mighty men. The wicked will be cast into Gehenna, and the righteous will live in a transformed heaven and earth.

One passage in the *Book of Jubilees*[5] is too important to be omitted, though it is not as clear as it might be. Referring to the state of the righteous dead the writer says:

> And their bones shall rest in the earth,
> And their spirits shall have much joy.[6]

which, if falling short of the hope of the resurrection, manifestly holds fast to a belief in immortality.

[1] Eccles. ix. 5. [2] To be dated before 170 B.C. [3] Date about 166–161 B.C.
[4] Date about 95–65 B.C. [5] Date about 135–105 B.C. [6] *Jub.*, xxiii. 31.

The *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*[1] goes much farther than this. It undoubtedly teaches a resurrection, both of Israel and the Gentiles, of good and evil alike. Thus: 'Then shall we also rise, each over our own tribe, and we shall worship the heavenly king. Then shall we all be changed, some into glory and some into shame. . . . And then so (shall He judge) all the Gentiles.'[2]

The *Second Book of Maccabees*[3] restricts the resurrection to the righteous, but advances on other writers in asserting that they will rise with their bodies to eternal life, apparently to share in the Messianic kingdom on the earth. Thus: 'And when he (i.e. the martyr-to-be) was required, he quickly put out his tongue, and stretched forth his hands courageously, with the noble words, These I had from heaven; for His name's sake I count them naught; from Him I hope to get them back again.'[4] But for the enemies of God there will be no resurrection: 'And when he (i.e. the martyr) was near his end, he said: "'Tis meet for those who perish at men's hands to cherish hope divine that they shall be raised up by God again; but thou—thou shalt have no resurrection to life."'[5]

We come next to the so-called *Psalms of Solomon*, which may be dated, with little doubt, about the middle of the first pre-Christian century. Here, though many questions remain unsolved,[6] the chief points are not in doubt. The righteous will rise to 'life eternal,' and in their 'eternal joy' inherit 'the promises of the Lord.' One verse may be quoted:

> But they that fear the Lord shall rise to life eternal,
> And their life (shall be) in the light of the Lord, and shall come to end no more.[7]

The fate of the wicked may or may not be total annihilation, but they will be consigned to 'Sheol and darkness and destruction, and they shall not be found in the day when the righteous obtain mercy.'

> The destruction of the sinner is for ever,
> And he shall not be remembered when the righteous is visited.[8]

[1] Date about 100 B.C., or earlier.
[2] *T. Benj.*, x. 7 ff.
[3] Probably near beginning of first century B.C.
[4] 2 Macc. vii. 10 f.; cf. also 22 f., xiv. 46.
[5] 2 Macc. vii. 14.
[6] *Vide* Viteau, *Psaumes de Salomon*, p. 59 f.
[7] Ps. Sol., iii. 16; cf. x. 9, xii. 8.
[8] Ps. Sol., iii. 13 f.; xiv. 6.

A passage from the *Fragments of a Zadokite Work* is of the greatest importance, because that work is attributed to a reformed section of the Sadducees, and is to be dated near the beginning of the first Christian century. Writing of God's mercy to repentant Israel, the writer says:

> They that hold fast to Him are for the life of eternity,
> And all the glory of man is for them.[1]

While stopping short of a belief in a resurrection, the writer, following Daniel, *Jubilees*, and the *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*, to which he refers, evidently accepts the doctrine of immortality.

On the whole, then, it is evident that the Jewish faith had made great progress in these matters during the two centuries immediately preceding Jesus Christ. And, while the progress is not uniform, a considerable number of writers advanced from the conception of the vague and uncertain shades of Sheol as the home of the departed, to a greater or less confidence in immortality, resurrection, and retribution. On this point opinion is unanimous, but it is much less so when the attempt is made to restrict these advanced beliefs to the Pharisees. That the Apocalyptic literature greatly influenced the views of the Pharisees may be granted, and that it was composed by men who leaned to the Pharisees, or were even members of that party, is equally indisputable; but the literature is of a peculiarly individual character, and the interests of its writers, while including the Law, were directed much more to visions of the future. Nevertheless, with the New Testament evidence before us, it is undeniable that the chief eschatological elements of the Apocalyptic literature had been absorbed by the party of the Pharisees in the time of Jesus.

What, then, of the Sadducees? It is clear that they never went so far as to believe in the resurrection, and, judging by their question to Jesus, could even poke fun at one of the theories of resurrection in vogue. It is more than possible, however, that this attitude was not uninfluenced by the fact that their rivals, the Pharisees, had adopted these newer Apocalyptic views. But it is a pure assumption to suppose that because the high-priestly party rejected the new belief in

[1] Zad. Frag., v. 6.

the resurrection they had made no advance at all beyond the old Sheol-conception. The 'Zadokite Fragment' certainly stands as a witness to their belief in immortality, and we must now return to the statement of Josephus on the point.

Attention has already been drawn to a remarkable variation in his references. In the *War* he had written of souls being removed into other bodies. On what Jewish evidence he based this alleged Pharisaic doctrine is not apparent, but presumably it would be more acceptable to his Greek and Roman readers than the pure resurrection-doctrine. Perhaps, however, his fellow Jews objected to this strange presentment of their faith. Whatever the cause, in the *Antiquities*, as we have seen, when he came once more to define the doctrine of the Pharisees, neither pure resurrection nor soul-removal is mentioned, but merely a continuance of the soul's life. It is quite obvious that Josephus was less concerned with an impartial and fearless statement of facts, than with the onerous task of so stating the Jewish case as to make the beliefs of his compatriots acceptable to his foreign readers. Hence, as immortality as an idea was quite palatable to Greeks, and the idea of resurrection was not, the former had to be squared with the latter. Probably his reference to the Sadducees was on no higher level of historical veracity. He knew that his readers loved symmetry, and so having stated the doctrine of the Pharisees as occupying one extreme, and that of the Essenes as the intermediate doctrine of immortality, nothing remained save that the Sadducees should keep the balance by holding the other extreme, viz. the complete destruction of soul and body at one and the same time.[1]

IV. Angels and Spirits.—On this subject our only information comes from the Acts of the Apostles. In describing the confusion which arose on the occasion when Paul told the Jerusalem Council that he stood for the resurrection of the dead, the writer of the Acts explains the cause of the tumult thus: 'For the Sadducees say that there is no resurrection, neither angel nor spirit; but the Pharisees confess both.'[2] Josephus, the Apocryphal and Apocalyptic literature, the Talmud, even the Zadokite Fragment, are all alike silent on the difference between the two parties respecting angels and spirits.

[1] *Vide* Leszynsky, *Die Sadduzäer*, p. 17 ff.

[2] Acts xxiii. 8.

The reference to the Pharisees presents no difficulty, but with the Sadducees it is otherwise. The vast majority of writers regard the statement as referring to *all* angels and spirits, and comment accordingly. Thus Schürer: 'This statement of the Acts, though not confirmed by other testimony, is nevertheless trustworthy, as in entire accordance with the picture which we elsewhere obtain of the two parties.'[1] Presumably, the particular point with which this description is in 'entire accordance' is the Sadducees' alleged disbelief in the resurrection and immortality, to which Schürer refers in his preceding paragraph. But if, as we have shown reason to believe, they had come to accept the doctrine of immortality, the harmony would be less obvious. A. E. Cowley, recognizing that the Sadducees held the Torah, which narrates angelic visits to earth, in especial honour, feels the difficulty of the statement in Acts. He does not see how they could abandon the teaching of the Torah, and can only suppose it to be caused by their materialistic tendency and opposition to the Pharisees.[2] J. D. Prince,[3] Fairweather,[4] Niven,[5] and others follow the usual view.

Canon Box, however, cannot accept the statement in the Acts in the ordinary sense. It 'can hardly mean . . . a mere denial of the reality of such existences, for it is obvious that the Pentateuch contains many narratives which affirm the activity and appearance of angels,' and he suggests that the reference may be only to the more recently elaborated system of angelology to which reference will be made presently.[6] Oesterley[7] is likewise indisposed to accept the common conclusion, and follows the suggestion of Leszynsky. This writer not only refers to the mention of angels in the Pentateuch, but points out that the Talmud nowhere indicates that the Sadducees denied the existence of angels and spirits. He then proceeds to make a suggestion which commends itself to Oesterley, viz. that perhaps Acts xxiii. 8 means that, as the Sadducees believed that the dead did not rise again, they also asserted that neither were they changed into angels or spirits.'[8]

It is obvious, then, that the question is not so simple as at first it appears to be. We need to be on our guard lest the

[1] Schürer, op. cit., II. ii. 14. [2] *E. B.*, 4239. [3] *E. B.*, 4323 f.
[4] *H. D. B.*, ext. vol., p. 288. [5] *D. A. C.*, ii. 439. [6] *E. R. E.*, xi. 45.
[7] *Bks. of Apoc.*, p. 148. [8] Op. cit., p. 91.

probably mistaken idea that the Sadducees denied the immortality of the soul should affect our judgement on the present point. And, after Leszynsky's acute remark, it is equally certain that we need to distinguish between angels and spirits who have never been human, and the transformation of deceased men into angels. It is further noteworthy that 'demons' are not mentioned, though we might have looked for the word in the passage cited from Acts in place of 'spirits.'

The two centuries before Jesus Christ had witnessed an enormous growth of ideas in the popular mind regarding the spirit-world. But the mention of 'angels' is not at all uncommon in the oldest *Old Testament literature*, and is expressed in various forms: e.g. angel, angels, the angel of God, and of Jehovah, His angel(s). It is noteworthy that all these terms may be found in the Pentateuch, though singularly enough they do not appear in the latest source 'P.' Later, as in Isaiah vi. and 1 Kings xxii. 19–22, angels appear as Jehovah's attendants or Council, and there are those who would interpret Genesis iii. 22 and xi. 7 in the same sense. The belief in the existence of supernatural beings, other than God, receives further testimony in 2 Kings ii. 12; vi. 17. But all these references fall far short of the ideas which find expression during and after the Exile, due perhaps to the influence of Zoroastrian teaching acting on their own purer and more transcendental conception of God. Ezekiel seems to stand at the parting of the ways, at one time receiving his message from God directly, at another through an intermediary.[1] Whereas Zechariah and Daniel receive their communications only through an intermediary.

The Book of Daniel[2] is of unique importance in the Old Testament development of this doctrine. Here two of the angels are mentioned by name: Gabriel[3] and Michael.[4] The gradation into ranks suggested in Isaiah vi. 2, 6 (where seraphim are referred to) and Ezekiel x. (where cherubim appear) becomes in Daniel a hierarchy with 'chief princes'—a half-way house to the still more fully developed gradation found in non-Canonical literature. Then, again, specific duties are now assigned to the angels on behalf of men and nations. Of the

[1] Ezek. xliv. 2; xl. 2.
[2] Dated about 168–165 B.C.
[3] Dan. viii. 16; ix. 21; cf. Luke i. 19, 26.
[4] Dan. x. 13, 21; xii. 1; cf. Jude 9, Rev. xii. 7.

latter they have become the patrons or tutelary spirits, representing in heaven the interests of the nations of earth. Possibly this had been suggested earlier in Isaiah xxiv. 21, but here it is for the first time expressed definitely. Michael is the warrior-guardian of Israel, and Persia and Greece in like manner each has its own heavenly champion.[1]

Passing now to the *non-Canonical writings*, we can merely outline the progress made. Other names of the angelic host are added to the two mentioned in Daniel: Raphael,[2] Uriel, Jeremiel,[3] and besides repeating Michael, Uriel, Raphael, and Gabriel, Enoch names Raguel, Sariel, Remeiel, and Phanuel.[4] The number of the most eminent of the hierarchy varies. Sometimes it is seven, and at other times four.[5] Their functions and ranks are also various. Generally they act as instruments of help and punishment in relation to men[6]; present the prayers of the saints before God[7]; make intercession with God on man's behalf[8]; and act as guardians of the nation.[9]

This growth of ideas, thus briefly sketched, has naturally provoked questioning as to its origin or impelling force. And, as was suggested above, the student has been driven to consider the possible influence of Zoroastrianism. Into this interesting inquiry we cannot enter here beyond saying that, while many similarities and points of contact have been established, Jewish writers, though doubtless influenced by Zoroastrian teaching, did not allow themselves to be overwhelmed by it. Striking differences exist between the two developments, and it may be that both the Mazdean and the Jewish faiths were alike considerably indebted to earlier Babylonian impulses.[10]

We may now return to our primary question, and ask how our two parties reacted to this elaborate angelology. It is to be remembered that great though the development was, it was more popular than official, and further, that each party had its own special preoccupation: that of the Pharisees being observance of the Law and that of the Sadducees attention to

[1] Dan. x. 13, 20 f.; xi. 1; xii. 1.
[2] Tobit iii. 17, &c.
[3] 2 (4) Esdras iv. 1, 36.
[4] Enoch ix. 1; xx. 1–7; xl. 2–10.
[5] Tobit xii. 15; Enoch xx. 1–7; xl. 2–10.
[6] 2 Macc. xi. 6; Enoch liii. 3, &c.
[7] Tobit xii. 12, 15.
[8] Enoch ix. 10; xv. 2.
[9] Enoch xx. 5; T. Lev. v. 6, T. Dan. vi. 2.
[10] *Vide* Driver *Com.*, Dan. xciv.; Gray 'Angel,' *E. B.*; Moulton 'Zoroas.' *H. D. B.*; Fairweather, 'Dev. Doct,' *H. D. B.*

the Cultus. Probably we should be justified in supposing that the Pharisees were the more likely to be influenced by the new ideas, especially as the books containing angelology proceeded from their ranks. But did they do more than give general countenance to the teaching, without binding themselves to all its fantastic details? The passage in Acts does not answer this question, and it is significant that the Mishnah avoids the teaching as much as possible. Leszynsky, in discussing 2 Maccabees, points out that the writer's evident belief in angels is not enough to prove that it proceeds from the Pharisees, for in the Mishnah little of this belief can be traced. He then, in a footnote, adds: 'Dr. Yahuda calls my attention to the fact that not once does the word angel occur in the Mishnah.'[1] Kohler goes quite as far when he writes: 'It is certainly significant, as David Neumark has pointed out, that the Mishnah eliminates every reference to the angels.'[2] Yet the Mishnah is mainly the developed theology of the Pharisees! Probably the truth is that, though the official scribal teachers and the majority of their Pharisaic followers had not committed themselves to all the more recent developments, a sufficiently large number of individual Pharisees had done so, and thus gave rise to the impression that it was the usual Pharisaic belief.

But what of the Sadducees? On one point no hesitation can be felt, viz. that they would reject the elaborations of Daniel and his successors. But it is surely incredible that they had turned their backs on the plain belief of the Pentateuch! Though the 'Priestly Code' never mentions angels, the 'Jehovist' and 'Elohist' do so, and the Sadducees stood as the champions of the whole Written Law. It seems, therefore, probable that the reference in Acts is to be taken as Leszynsky understands it. 'Immortality' itself was for them a difficult enough doctrine, but they could not go so far as to accept the popular belief that dead men were transformed into angels and might even appear to their friends on earth (as in Acts xii. 15). It is in this sense, then, we ought to understand the statement that 'the Sadducees say there is no resurrection, neither angel, nor spirit.'[3]

V. Fate and Free-will.—As in the preceding section, so in the present we are unfortunately restricted to one source

[1] *Die Sadduzäer*, p. 178. [2] *Jewish Theology*, p. 186. [3] Acts xxiii. 8.

for direct information. On the subject of 'Angels and Spirits' we were dependent on a passage in the New Testament; in the present case we have only the references in Josephus, and these we now quote: '. . . the Pharisees . . . ascribe all things to Fate and God, and yet allow that to do what is right or the contrary is principally in men's power, although fate co-operates in every action.' '. . . the Sadducees . . . take away Fate entirely [and suppose that God is not the cause of our doing or not doing what is bad],[1] and they say that to do what is good or bad lies in men's own choice, and that the one or the other so belongs to every one that they may act as they please.' 'As for the Pharisees . . . when they say that all things happen by Fate, they do not take away from men the freedom of acting as they think fit; since their notion is, that it has pleased God to mix up the decrees of Fate and man's will, so that man can act virtuously or viciously.' 'As for the Pharisees, they say that some, but not all, actions are the work of Fate, and some are in our own power, either to do or not to do. And the Essenes affirm that Fate governs all things, and that nothing befalls men but what is according to its decree. But the Sadducees take away Fate, and say that there is no such thing, and that the events of human life are not at its disposal, so that we ourselves are the authors of what is good, and bring our troubles on ourselves by our own folly.'[2]

As will be seen by these quotations, Josephus again discovers a graded attitude among the Jewish parties; at one extreme are the Essenes who, according to the historian, hold Fate absolutely; then come the Pharisees, who combine Fate with Free-will; and at the further extreme are the Sadducees, who eliminate Fate altogether, and make all human affairs the result of Free Determination.

It is certainly noteworthy that there is no evidence of these striking differences in any other quarter, as for instance in the non-Canonical literature, the New Testament, or the Talmud. Such testimony as these sources afford goes indeed in an opposite direction, or at least seems to show a general tendency to maintain both an overruling Providence (or Fate) and Free-will. Yet, until recently, nearly all writers on the

[1] The passage within brackets is rejected by many modern writers: Schürer, op. cit., II. ii. 14, *n.*; Hölscher, op. cit., p. 4, *n.*

[2] *War*, II., viii., 14; *Ant.*, XVIII., i., 3; XIII., v., 9.

Jewish parties felt themselves obliged to take the testimony of Josephus at its face value, though in some cases not without obvious misgiving. Thus, Graetz explains the Pharisees' standpoint: 'Everything happened according to the Eternal decrees,' &c.[1] Most moderns have been content to follow the lead of Schürer, who, while modifying the account of Josephus, holds to its fundamental accuracy. He states that what we have is 'a strongly Hellenized colouring of Jewish views. Still, it is merely the garment that is borrowed from Greece. The matter itself is genuinely Jewish,' and is merely a blend of the two Old Testament conceptions of divine omnipotence and man's moral responsibility. But even if this were accepted as a satisfactory explanation of the Pharisees' view, it leaves one wondering what the Jewish historian's description of the Sadducees can mean. Schürer does little to help his readers here, merely suggesting that in the case 'of the Sadducees the human factor occupied the foreground.'[2] J. D. Prince,[3] Fairweather,[4] A. E. Cowley,[5] D. Eaton,[6] Jos. Mitchell,[7] and M. H. Segal[8] take a position little different from Schürer's. Segal considers it incredible that Pharisees and Sadducees would dispute about the abstract question of Fate, which was foreign to the Jewish mind. The topic was really 'Providence,' whether God 'interferes in human affairs in order to direct them to a definite aim.' But whereas the Pharisees believed this, their opponents denied that God was concerned whether man did good or evil.[9] Apparently this writer can see no more good in the Sadducees than Josephus himself could.

But the unsatisfactoriness of Josephus's description has aroused much hesitation and even scepticism among a few recent writers. Thus Leszynsky, while pointing out that the influence of Hellenism may have provoked discussion among the Jews on these fundamental questions, rejects the idea that Jewish parties ever ranged themselves in such clean-cut categories as Josephus suggests.[10] Canon Box,[11] Oesterley,[12] and W. S. Niven[13] are also sceptical of Josephus's accuracy.

A glance at the relevant literature will enable the reader

[1] *Hist. Jews*, II., p. 17 f. [2] Schürer, op. cit., II. ii. 15 f.
[3] *E. B.*, art. 'Scribes and Pharisees.' [4] *H. D. B.*, art. 'Develop. Doctrine.'
[5] *E. B.*, art. 'Sadducees.' [6] *H. D. B.*, arts. 'Pharisees' and 'Sadducees.'
[7] *D. C. G.*, art. 'Sadducees.' [8] *Expos.*, VIII., xiii., 81–108.
[9] Ibid., p. 98. [10] Op. cit., p. 19. [11] *Expos.*, VIII. xv. 19 ff.
[12] *Bks. of Apoc.*, 144 f. [13] *D. A. C.*, art. 'Sadducees.'

to form his own conclusions. So far as the *Old Testament* in general is concerned, and the Pentateuch in particular, from first to last it teaches both the doctrines under consideration, —Divine Providence and human freedom. The Jewish theologian, K. Kohler, in a recent volume, has two chapters, one on 'Providence and the Moral Government of the World,' and the other on 'Free-will and Moral Responsibility,'[1] and shows conclusively that Old Testament writings contain both these ideas throughout. In the Pentateuch we read of decision by 'lot' and the appeal to the 'Oracle,'[2] and they are frequently mentioned in the early historical books. Behind these practices lies a firm belief in the guidance of Jehovah, and indeed the whole Pentateuch is filled with the consciousness that the life of the people is directed by the Most High.[3] Equally fundamental was the belief in Free-will and moral responsibility, from the appeal of God to Cain to the exhortation contained in the discourse of Moses.[4]

We have again emphasized the Pentateuch because of the special esteem with which it was always regarded by both parties. Turning next to the *non-Canonical literature*, we find the same two ideas existing side by side. In Sirach, which, as we have already noted, is an early expression of the Sadducean tendency, there is an entire section[5] on the overruling of God, containing such sentences as :

Good and evil, life and death, poverty and wealth, come from Jahveh.
The gift of Jahveh abideth for the righteous, and His good pleasure is ever successful.
The blessing of God is the portion of the righteous, and at the right time His hope shall flourish.

But the author is equally clear on the subject of man's free-will :

Say not, 'From God is my transgression,' for that which He hateth made He not.
If thou (so) desirest, thou canst keep the commandment.
. . . . . .
He commanded no man to sin, nor gave strength to men of lies.[6]

[1] *Jewish Theol.*, chaps. 28 and 37.
[2] Lev. xvi. 8 f.; Num. xxvi. 56; Exod. xxviii. 30, &c.
[3] Cf. Exod. xix. 4; Deut. xxxii. 11 f.
[4] Gen. iv. 7; Deut. xxx. 15–19; cf. Jer. xxi. 8.
[5] Ecclus. xi. 14–28. [6] Ecclus. xv. 11–20.

Again, the Book of Enoch, which is of Pharisaic origin, joins the same two notes :

Even so sin has not been sent on the earth,
But man of himself has created it,
And under a great curse shall they fall who commit it.[1]

Another Pharisaic production, the Psalms of Solomon, may be quoted :

Our works are subject to our own choice and power
To do right or wrong in the works of our hands ;
And in Thy righteousness Thou visitest the sons of men.[2]

In one passage this Pharisaic representative does indeed seem to incline to fatalism, the alleged aberration of the Sadducees, but it is only a temporary lapse :

For man and his portion (lie) before Thee in the balance ;
He cannot add to, so as to enlarge, what has been prescribed by Thee.[3]

Even the *Zadokite Fragment*, issuing from a reformed Sadduceeism, is in complete accord with the Pharisaic quotation, and gives no sign that this implies any change of view in the party for which it speaks. Of a belief in the effective influence of Providence we have abundant proof in such words as :

For God chose them not (i.e. the unrepentant) from the beginning of the world,
And ere they were formed He knew their works.
. . . . . .
But them He hated He made to go astray.[4]

The possibility and power of Free-will are clear enough throughout, but the following passage may suffice :

Because they did their own will,
And kept not the commandment of their Maker,
Until His wrath was kindled against them.[5]

[1] Enoch xcviii. 4. [2] Ps. Sol., ix. 7 f. [3] Ps. Sol., v. 6.
[4] Zad. Frag., ii. 6, 10. [5] Zad. Frag., iii. 7; cf. iv. 2, 10.

Here, then, in writings which originate in both Sadducean and Pharisaic quarters, we find the two well-known doctrines of the Pentateuch lying side by side, without even the appearance of any dispute about them or that they represent the touchstone of orthodoxy.

The evidence of the New Testament, slight as it is, is entirely of the same kind. But as it is only in regard to the Sadducees' belief in an over-ruling Providence that doubt exists, we may restrict attention to this one point. And what do we find? Sadducees come to the baptism of John because they feared 'the wrath to come'; they ask Jesus 'to show them a sign from heaven'; and agree with Gamaliel's argument that it might be wise not to interfere unnecessarily with the apostles, 'lest haply ye be found even to be fighting against God,'[1] Manifestly such men must have held a belief in Providence.

The result of this brief survey is not therefore in doubt: apart from Josephus, all the available evidence goes to show that both the two great parties held to a belief in Providence and in individual responsibility. Also, the conclusion to which one is forced is plain: Josephus is, in this matter, as in many others, unreliable. As Kohler says '. . . we must not accept too easily the words of this Jewish historian, who wrote for his Roman masters and, therefore, represented the Jewish parties as so many philosophical schools after the Greek pattern.'[2]

That Josephus did seek to make his representation of the Jews both philosophical and symmetrical is written large in his works. In one passage he compares the Pharisees with the Stoics,[3] in another the Essenes with the Pythagoreans,[4] and, though not directly comparing the Sadducees with the Epicureans, gives us a description of this latter sect strikingly similar to that given elsewhere of the Sadducees.[5] Yet, while regarding the foregoing as a sound conclusion, one may quite justifiably surmise that there must have been some Sadducean characteristics to give plausibility to Josephus's statement. On this point two valuable *suggestions* have been made, and we may venture to add a third.

1. Kohler, having rejected the supposition that the Sadducees refused belief in Providence, surmises that the reference was

[1] Matt iii. 7; xvi. 1; Acts v. 39 f. [2] Op. cit., p. 234.
[3] *Life*, 2. [4] *Ant.*, xv. x. 4. [5] Cf. *Ant.*, x. xi. 7 with xiii. v. 9.

to 'prophesying.'[1] As he points out, the Essenes prophesied frequently, the Pharisees did so occasionally, but the Sadducees never. This suggestion has such support as may be derived from the well-known tendency of the Sadducees to place the prophetical literature on a much lower level than the legal.

2. To this Leszynsky adds the difference of view between the parties on the subject of 'Prayer.' Prayers are certainly referred to in the narrative portions of the Pentateuch, but in the Law itself are only once mentioned,[2] and nowhere enjoined. Prescriptions in regard to prayer come from post-exilic traditions. And as the Sadducees dared not construct prayers, seeing these are wanting in the Torah, they were obliged logically to deny in general both the aim and necessity of prayer. Hence the origin of Josephus's statement that they believed that man's good and evil fortune depended on himself.[3]

3. May there not have been another operating factor? The Apocalyptic movement, at this time so powerful, confidently anticipated direct divine intervention in the interest of the saints. Great emphasis was laid on this expectation. The Roman intervention under Pompey was clearly regarded by the author of the Psalms of Solomon as the act of God; and in like manner, and in His own time, God would vindicate the faithful. By large numbers it was believed that this divine vindication would take the form of a world catastrophe and quite independently of man. Consequently, the high-priestly party, which busied itself in dutiful observance of the Temple services and entirely ignored these (to them) fanatical hopes, might quite easily gain for itself, however undeservedly, the reputation of lacking faith in Divine Providence and of depending wholly on human effort.

[1] *J.E.*, v., p. 228. [2] Deut. xxvi. 1–15. [3] *Die Sadduzäer*, p. 19 ff.

Chapter VII

RELATIONS WITH JESUS AND THE EARLY CHURCH

A. The Pharisees

Introductory

In pre-critical days it was assumed that this part of the history of the two parties admitted of simple and straightforward statement. All that was required was a résumé of controversies recorded in the Gospels, followed by deductions, deplorable, indeed, but unhappily beyond all reasonable dispute. To-day our course is less simple and easy. Modern Jews, themselves careful students of their own history and rightly jealous for the reputation of their faith, protest that this Synoptic record is contrary to what their own Talmud, reveals of the Pharisees, and urge that it is neither fair nor accurate. It is impossible, they argue, that so grave an indictment can be maintained against a class of men who bequeathed to the world the noble body of truth contained in the Talmud and from whom came forth Judaism as it has been known to the world ever since. This plea has awakened a ready response among Christian writers, and even where there is no disposition to admit in advance that the former judgement was essentially erroneous, the demand for an unbiased re-examination of the evidence is felt to be too strong to be resisted.

But quite apart from this demand, recent study of the Synoptic Gospels has revealed a noteworthy difference among the writers in the degree of condemnation they assign to at least one of our parties, the Pharisees, and the suggestion of tendency or bias, for or against, is one that cannot be ignored.

In fact, with their usual fairmindedness, modern students have rather welcomed the possibility of shifting responsibility for the antagonism to Jesus from the shoulders of the Pharisaic

party as a whole, to certain extremists, as, for example, the school of Shammai. That the Pharisees had acute differences among themselves is well known, and the evidence that the Shammaites were in the time of Jesus both truculent and predominant must, of course, be considered.

As will be seen, the plea for a revised estimate touches mainly the Pharisees. The Sadducees, alas! have almost no advocates in these days. Nothing too bad can be said of them, apparently, and the modern Jew appears to be quite indifferent to their fate at the hands of the investigator. None the less, even without advocates, they are likely enough to receive substantial justice in modern times, for an investigation into the history of the one party involves that of the other.

A. Pharisees

It makes for clearness to deal with the two parties separately. They appear to join forces now and then in their opposition to Jesus, but the grounds of that opposition were different. Moreover, the Sadducees came but little into contact with Jesus until towards the close of His life.

New Testament Evidence.—From what has been said already, it is obvious that the evidence of the New Testament can only be used after careful examination. It is no longer possible, in presence of the arguments used, to take that testimony at its face value without scrutiny. Not long ago[1] C. T. Dimont set forth the results of such a survey in the pages of the *Expositor*,[2] and his conclusions demand consideration. In his article the writer examines first the Marcan passages which are repeated by one or both of the other Synoptists; secondly, passages in the First and Third Gospels based on the non-Marcan source, i.e. Q; and thirdly, passages found in only one of the Synoptists. The conclusions reached are, briefly, as follows: In Mark the Pharisees always appear in opposition to Jesus, and there is no redeeming feature in their behaviour; this opposition is not set forth as of slow growth, but begins at an early period of His ministry. In Matthew 'this sinister portrait' is drawn in 'even darker lines,' the writer betraying 'a strong prejudice against the Pharisees,' who 'figure as the implacable foes of Christ, intent on destroying Him,' and 'their bitterness continues to show itself even after the crucifixion';

[1] In 1911. [2] *Expositor*, VIII. i. 231 ff.

'the writer is actuated throughout by a strong dislike of the Pharisaic party.' Luke is different, and 'does not commit himself to an indiscriminate condemnation' of the Pharisees; 'he takes pains to discern between the good and the evil that were in them,' and in his later work states that 'some of them became members of the Christian Church.[1]

The writer then offers an explanation of these different representations. Matthew was probably greatly influenced by the Apocalyptic literature of the period, such as the 'Assumption of Moses,' the 'Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs,' and 'Enoch,' and was consequently in deep sympathy with the popular religious aspirations of the day. Possibly he was himself reckoned by the Pharisees among the Am-Ha-Aretz, whom they despised, and to such a man, all Pharisaic exclusiveness would be especially hateful. Luke, on the other hand, was by temperament, education, and associations, accustomed to discriminate; also, being a follower of Paul, a former Pharisee, he took pains to show the 'mixed' character of the Pharisees as a class. What our writer thinks of Mark he does not say. Possibly we are to infer that, compared with the other two, he was free from bias.

On this the following observations may be made:

1. There can be little doubt that in their treatment of the Pharisees, as in other matters, differences are to be found among the Synoptists—omissions and additions which call for inquiry. But whether the total effect produced on the reader by the three portraits is substantially different, is another and less certain matter. If Matthew describes them as 'blind guides,'[2] the implication is not different in Mark,[3] and Luke obviously has the Pharisees and their Scribes in mind when he represents Jesus as asking: 'Can the blind guide the blind?'[4] for who but these two classes attempted leadership of the people? Matthew's charge of 'Formalism' is set forth in Luke also,[5] similar in essentials if briefer and less detailed in form. And if Matthew emphasizes the Pharisees' 'hypocrisy,'[6] it is contained in Mark also, and still more emphatically in Luke. Further, the short passage in Luke on the Pharisees' character[7] is in spirit of the same nature as

[1] Acts xv. 5. [2] Matt. xv. 14; xxiii. 16, 24. [3] Mark viii. 11–13.
[4] Luke vi. 39. [5] Matt. v. 17–vi. 18; Luke xi. 37–54.
[6] Matt. vi. 2 ff.; Mark vii. 6 ff.; Luke vi. 42; xii. 1.
[7] Luke xi. 37–54; Matt. xxiii.; Luke xvi. 14.

the terrible charges in Matthew, and to this should be added Luke's charge of covetousness, recorded by no other Evangelist. Luke's parable of the Pharisee and Publican at prayer in the Temple may be more a criticism of the Pharisaic system rather than of the individual Pharisee, as Dimont suggests, following Godet, but in either case the writer's representation of what Jesus condemns is the same. While not denying, therefore, the existence of differences of emphasis,[1] the facts brought forward produce portraits which in their broad outlines are practically identical.

2. But, it will be asked, how are the differences, such as they are, to be accounted for? Dimont ascribes them to bias, Matthew's against, and Luke's for, the Pharisees. But if it is the case, as above suggested, not that we have essentially different portraits, but, rather, portraits drawn on different scales and with differences in details, another obvious factor may go far to explain, and perhaps to explain better, these features. This is, that the Synoptists in their choice of material had mainly in view the interests and requirements of their probable readers. Writing of Matthew's Gospel, Moffatt says: 'The Jewish Christian traits of his Gospel are, however, largely due to the Palestinian traditions which he employed, as well as to the thesis of his own work, viz. that Christianity as the law and righteousness of God had superseded the old as a revelation of God to men.'[2] And this generally accepted view seems quite sufficient to explain the facts brought forward by Dimont.

To exaggerate the deep and bitter opposition of the Pharisees to Jesus would go far to cut away the ground under the feet of any Christians who supposed that the old type of religion could be reconciled with the new. Moreover, while it is very difficult to believe that Matthew (or the compiler) would harbour resentment for so long a time after the events, which is Dimont's theory, it is quite easy to understand his drawing on half-forgotten memories if, as Wellhausen affirms: 'Matthew has in view the primitive Church of Jerusalem, which sought to hold fast by Judaism in spite of everything.'[3] In regard to the work of Luke, a similar argument

[1] Cf. *Allen, Com. Matt. I. C. C.*, p. lxxviii.
[2] *Introd. Lit. N. T.*, 3rd ed., p. 256.
[3] *Einleitung* (2nd ed.), p. 62, quoted by Moffatt, Introd., p. 256, *n*.

holds, though in his case the application goes to explain his slighter treatment of the Pharisees. To quote Moffatt again, 'The omissions, insertions, and alterations in the Gospel are sufficiently well marked to bring out several of his predilections, e.g. his sense that Gentile readers would not be specially interested in the criticism of the Jewish Law.'[1] Of Mark nothing need be said, as his impartiality is not challenged.

3. While, however, unable to find ground for the allegation of bias on the part of Matthew on the one side, or of Luke on the other, we shall sacrifice nothing material by laying chief stress on the more approved Marcan narratives, which may be supplemented from Q.

I. The Attitude of the Pharisees to Jesus.

At first this appears to have been one of suspicion and critical observation only. The Scribes (probably 'of the Pharisees'[2]; Luke says:[3] 'the Scribes and the Pharisees') quickly detected the significance of His forgiving sin, and pointed out the vastness of the claim which it implied. His eating with 'publicans and sinners' likewise impressed the same observers unfavourably[4]; they also asked Him to explain why His disciples did not fast like those of the Baptist and the Pharisees[5]; and questioned him sharply respecting His disciples' breach of the Sabbath Law.[6] One can neither wonder at nor object to this early attitude. The position of Jesus alike as a teacher and a healer was irregular and unauthorized. 'He taught them as having authority, and not as the Scribes.'[7] To them He was only a peasant, without the knowledge considered requisite for the office of teacher, whereas they laid special emphasis on the possession of technical knowledge of the Law, and knew no religion apart from that Law.[8] Yet, it may be asked, why did they treat the Baptist differently? Probably because John did not meddle with the Law, made no claims for himself, and merely called the nation to 'repentance unto remission of sins.' He was a prophet, not a teacher. Jesus claimed to be both, and manifestly possessed greater personal powers. Hence the need for a more careful and critical examination of His words and deeds. But there were

[1] Moffatt, op. cit., p. 280.
[2] Cf. Mark ii. 5–7.
[3] Luke v. 21.
[4] Mark ii. 16.
[5] Mark ii. 18.
[6] Mark ii. 23 f.
[7] Mark i. 22.
[8] Cf. Herford, *Pharisaism*, p. 130 f.

other reasons. 'Messianic ideas were abroad, zealots were appearing, and a false Messiah could work ruin. Jesus arose as a prophetic man in Galilee, independent of them. From boyhood He had learnt nothing from the Scribes, and everybody felt the authority of His words.'[1]

But this period of mere suspicion and criticism soon passed into active hostility. This is a development which leaps to the eye and is quite beyond dispute. Nor are the reasons far to seek. 'We are shown (by Mark), in a series of rapid sketches, the causes of this opposition in the revolutionary character of Jesus' ministry, and His quiet disregard of Pharisaic traditions and customs. He calls a publican to the inner circle of His disciples, and eats with publicans and sinners; He decries formal fastings, heals on the Sabbath, defends eating with unwashed hands, and denounces all traditionalism. There can be no doubt that this rapid succession of events, all of the same character, is intended to produce the effect described, and to show us how, early in the ministry of Jesus, He was forced into opposition to the ruling sect, and so the way was prepared for the end.'[2] To what extent the Pharisees shared responsibility for His death is a matter of dispute. Outwardly, the Sadducean authorities took the leading part, but it is more than doubtful whether they would have gone as far as they did without the continuous pressure exerted by the Pharisees and their Scribes.[3]

For the most part this opposition is admitted and largely justified by modern Jewish apologists, the only matter in doubt being whether the whole class of Pharisees was responsible, or only one or more of the sections into which they were at this time divided. This can be more suitably considered after the character of the opposition has been examined.

Grounds for Antagonism.

It would be difficult, if not impossible, to arrange these in exact historical sequence, and indeed the early chapters of Mark suggest that the grounds of offence appeared at a very

[1] Scott, *D. C. G.*, ii. 355, art. 'Pharisees.'

[2] Gould, *Com. Mark*, *I. C. C.*, p. xiv.

[3] 'The Pharisees and Scribes were the first to assume an attitude of hostility and criticism to Jesus. They maintained this attitude all through His public ministry, down to the very close; for although in the last days of His life the Sadducees were most prominent, the Pharisaic Scribe also took part in His trial and condemnation' (Eaton, *H. D. B.*, art. 'Pharisees,' iii., 828).

early stage in His career. There five incidents are recorded, in each of which opposition makes its appearance: (1) in the healing of the paralytic, in the course of which Jesus claimed the power to forgive sins; (2) His eating with 'publicans and sinners'; (3) the abstention of His disciples from fasting, in contrast with those of the Baptist and the Pharisees; (4) the plucking of ears of corn on the Sabbath by the disciples; (5) and the climax was reached when He healed a man with a withered hand on the Sabbath day. Following these events the antagonism solidified.[1] The late Principal A. M. Fairbairn declared that the 'antagonism of Christ and the Pharisees was thus essential and radical'; they 'were like personalized antitheses, the Pharisees representing tradition, Christ the rights of the spirit inspired by God'; he further denied that Cohen (*Les Pharisiens*, ii., p. 29) stated the whole difficulty in declaring that 'the antagonism existed only as to questions of conduct'; 'the Pharisees never imagined that He could be right, or they wrong'; 'they could not allow their Judaism to perish, and it was better that they should ruin Christ than that He should ruin it.'[2] These are serious allegations, and, whether right or wrong, express the common conclusions of most New Testament students. It will be necessary, therefore, to examine some of the incidents upon which they are based.

1. *Attitude of Jesus to Publicans and Sinners.*

In the foreground of the Marcan narrative there is the instance associated with the call of Levi (or Matthew).[3] Jesus attended a feast provided either by Levi or, possibly, Himself, apparently to celebrate the event, or, as A. B. Bruce suggests, to give Him a suitable opportunity of meeting Levi's fellow tax-gatherers and pursuing His mission among them. The incident is recorded by the three Synoptists, and each records the complaint of the Pharisees (or their Scribes, or both Pharisees and Scribes) that Jesus should eat with 'publicans and sinners.' That this was no isolated circumstance in the life of Jesus is not denied. The case of Zacchæus and that of the woman who was a 'sinner' are but outstanding instances of what was the regular, declared mission of Jesus: 'I came not to call the righteous, but sinners.'[4]

[1] Mark ii.–iii. 6. [2] Fairbairn, *Expos.*, I., viii., 431 ff.

[3] Mark ii. 13–17; Matt. ix. 9–13; Luke v. 27–32.

[4] Mark ii. 17; cf. Matt. xi. 19 with Luke vii. 34; Matt. xxi. 31 f.; Luke vii. 29, 39, xv. 1 f., xix. 1–9.

It is unnecessary to attempt a defence of the 'publicans and sinners' as such, and indeed in the case of many of them their manner of life would make it a thankless task. Our only concern is that, whereas the Pharisees and others treated them with disdain, Jesus, running all the risks, went amongst them with the object of redeeming them, and that to this conduct exception was taken.

Modern Jews recognize the onus laid upon them of dealing with this great contrast between the methods of Jewish teachers and Jesus. Professor I. Abrahams, after citing the Mishnaic Tractate *Sanhedrin*[1] to the effect that the 'pure-minded in Jerusalem would not sit down to a meal unless they knew who their table-companions were to be,' maintains that 'the motive was neither pride nor exclusiveness, but a desire that the meal should not degenerate into mere eating and drinking,' and adds to this certain 'fears as to neglected tithes,' &c. He further states that a Pharisee would not have declined to receive even 'sinners' *at his own table*, but at *their* table 'the ritual and atmosphere could hardly fail to be uncongenial.' The Pharisee may have been wanting in courage, and may have exaggerated the force of evil example in dealing with the sinful classes, but the taint of self-righteousness was slight. He nevertheless admits a striking difference between the methods of the Pharisees and Jesus. 'There was in the Pharisaism of all ages a real anxiety to make the return of the sinner easy. It was inclined to leave the initiative to the sinner, except that it always maintained God's readiness to take the first step. Jesus in His attitude towards sin and sinners was more inclined to take the initiative. Yet, until the modern epoch of a new humanism, society has worked by reprobation rather than attraction, and the practical methods of Western communities in dealing with criminals have been as harsh as the methods of any other system. And Rabbis did often act in the same spirit as Jesus.'

'One might put it generally by asserting that the Rabbis attacked vice from the preventive side; they aimed at keeping men and women honest and chaste. Jesus approached it from the curative side; He aimed at saving the dishonest and the unchaste.'[2]

[1] *Sanhedrin*, 23 *a*.

[2] Abrahams, *Pharisaism and the Gospels*, pp. 56–59.

C. G. Montefiore also freely admits the contrast between the two methods in words which leave little to be desired : ' But it should be noted that there is nothing anti-Jewish in the bearing and teaching of Jesus in this matter. . . . But to deny the greatness and originality of Jesus in this connexion, to deny that He opened a new chapter in men's attitude towards sin and sinners, is, I think, to beat the head against the wall.' Commenting on Luke xv. 1 he further remarks : ' Surely this is a new note, something which we have not yet heard in the Old Testament or of *its* heroes. " The sinners drew near to Him " : His teaching did not repel them. It did not palter with or make light of sin, but it gave comfort to the sinner. The virtues of repentance are gloriously praised in the Rabbinical literature, but this direct search for and appeal to the sinner are new and moving notes of high import and significance.'[1]

With this judgement, so frank and generous from a Jewish writer, there will be general agreement. Jesus, it may be said, was only in this, as in other matters, before His time. But it was more than the opposition of two different systems in contact with irreligious people, the one contenting itself with reprobating the sinner and the other treating him kindly. It was the manifestation of a new and diviner spirit, the spirit of divine compassion, which leaves the ninety and nine and goes after the one—not despite his being lost, but because of it. Without this new spirit and example, to which the Pharisees objected, the dynamic of the new relationship to evildoers would have been wanting and the new time would never have come. The difference between Jesus and the Pharisees is not only no discredit to Him, it is His abiding glory.

2. Jesus and the Jewish Law.

There can be no doubt that it was the attitude of Jesus to the Law which provoked hostility most keenly, and it may be well to recall how extensive the Jewish Law was at this time. It was both written and oral, religious, moral, and ceremonial. ' From Hillel onwards the Pharisees had elaborated a civil code, by means of tradition and exegesis, from the Scriptures. The great loss to religion in such a process was in making it largely negative. The Rabbis counted 248 classes

[1] Montefiore, *Syn. Gos.*, i., 86, ii., 985.

of things to be done, and 365 of things forbidden.'[1] As we shall see presently, it was against this system as a whole that the young prophet offended. Though Jesus claimed that He had not come to destroy the Law (Torah), but to fulfil it.[2] Herford urges, not incorrectly, that He had one idea of how this could be best accomplished and the Jews another. ' He did not at once become aware that what He conceived religion to be was something that could not be expressed in terms of Torah. The Pharisees perceived the discrepancy sooner than He did ; and while He found another form for His religion, they adhered to the old form because that was what they knew, and they could not comprehend anything different.'[3] Wernle argues to a similar effect, holding that though Jesus was in reality opposed to the Jewish conception of Law and Religion, He was for the most part unaware of it. ' Jesus spent the whole of His life in the faith that He had the Law on His side and that He Himself was its true interpreter.' But ' it was His incomplete knowledge of the Law which was in this point the cause of an entire deception on the part of Jesus. He took from the Law only that which harmonized with His views, and so overlooked the fact that His opponents too had the Law on their side, and that with far greater right.'[4] It is difficult to accept the explanation that the mental outlook of Jesus was so limited and naïve, nor is the suggestion quite self-consistent. If Jesus deliberately chose some laws and rejected others, His range of knowledge could hardly have been limited to those He favoured, even though it may not have included the whole Law in detail. Nor is it likely that He was as long as is supposed by Herford in discovering the essential difference between the current conception of religion and His own. Referring to the Jewish idea, Bousset remarks : ' . . . when God demands righteousness, everything turns on the good works preponderating in number over the evil. Life becomes a balance-sheet, a constant reckoning of the balance which the pious has with God.'[5] Is it probable that the Teacher who summarized the Law in ' Love to God and man ' was a whole lifetime, or even a considerable part of it, in finding out the essential antagonism between the two opposing conceptions?

[1] Scott, art. ' Pharisees,' *D. C. G.*, ii., 353 f. [2] Matt. v. 17.
[3] Herford, *Pharisaism*, 145 f. [4] Wernle, *Beg. Christianity*, i. 88, 90.
[5] Bousset, *Rel. des Jud.*, p. 372.

(*a*) *In general, Jesus accepted the Law and obeyed it, like all good Jews.* The time came, how soon we do not know, when He criticized it, but He never ignored or violated the Law as a whole, and when He felt Himself obliged to transgress some of its details, He was always able to furnish considered reasons for doing so. If, for the moment, as Wernle demands, we ignore the claim in the First Gospel that Jesus came not to destroy, but to fulfil the Law,[1] and confine ourselves to His practice, the truth of our thesis is none the less apparent. He treated 'the Law and the Prophets' as inspired and authoritative, and argued from them as such; He regarded the Decalogue as showing the way to Eternal Life[2]; He conformed to the Law's requirements, as in the case of the cleansed leper and the demand for the Temple tax[3]; He recognized it as possessing such high authority that it would never pass away.[4] Even Matthew records Christ's plain command to obey the teachings of the Scribes (and Pharisees),[5] and that, too, in the very chapter where the terrible 'Woes' are uttered. Indeed, it is His complaint against His opponents that their 'traditions' make 'void the Word of God,'[6] thus manifestly exalting the Written if at the expense of the Oral Law.

The much-contested passage in Matthew,[7] whether genuine or not, is in no discord with the acts of Jesus, and is entirely consistent with His whole attitude towards His people's great heritage. He 'came not to destroy, but to fulfil.' The Scribes and Pharisees evidently thought otherwise, and, viewed from their different standpoints, both He and they were right. By Jesus the Law was regarded as the servant or handmaid of religion, which was in reality an affair of the heart. When, therefore, He summarized the Law in 'love to God and man,' He affirmed: 'On these two commandments hangeth the whole Law and the Prophets,'[8] i.e. on obedience to the underlying spirit of the Law rather than on the most flawless obedience to its myriad details. 'Fulfilment' of the Law, according to Jesus, implied not only, or chiefly, outward obedience to it, but the perception of its inner and deeper significance, a standard of devotion higher than most of His opponents had even imagined, a relationship which was not

[1] Matt. v. 17. [2] Mark x. 17 ff. [3] Mark i. 44, and pars.; Matt. xvii. 24 ff.
[4] Matt. v. 18; Luke xvi. 17. [5] Matt. xxiii. 3.
[6] Mark vii. 13. [7] Matt. v. 17–20. [8] Matt. xxii. 40.

only not destructive but constructive, in the highest degree.[1] Without laying undue stress on the difference between the 'Golden Rule' as stated by Hillel and by Jesus, the change by the latter is certainly characteristic and symptomatic of a righteousness which exceeded that of the Scribes and Pharisees. Such an attitude certainly does not tend to destroy the Law, but rather to fulfil it. 'Jesus fulfils the Old Testament system by rounding out into entire completeness what is incomplete in that system. In this process of fulfilment all that is imperfect, provisional, temporary, or, for any reason, needless to the perfect religion, falls away of its own accord, and all that is essential and permanent is conserved and embodied in Christianity.'[2]

(*b*) *In some matters Jesus was a severe critic of the Law.* If it is true, as we have contended, that Jesus was true to the spirit of the Law, it is equally true that in some respects His attitude towards it, as it stood, was one of criticism. Harnack[3] divides this criticism into two sections. In the first he places actions which, when correctly interpreted, contradict not the authority of Moses, but Pharisaic traditions. When Jesus says, e.g. 'Ye have heard . . . of old time . . . but I say,' &c., He refers to the Scribes, not Moses. So, too, when charged with permitting His disciples to break the Sabbath Law, He appeals in justification to the Old Testament, where similar breaches were allowed under exceptional circumstances. In the second section he places words and acts which he regards as real departures from the Law, e.g. 'Swear not at all,' 'resist not evil,' 'love your enemies,' 'the Sabbath was made for man,' 'man is not defiled by externals,' and 'association with the unclean.' These, he admits, were genuine contradictions of the Mosaic Law, though, he adds, strangely enough, that Jesus was unaware of the divergence.

This criticism of the Law may be set forth in the following way:

(i) Jesus ignored some of the 'Traditions of the Elders.'[4] but only when they appeared to possess no moral value, or were opposed to the performance of higher moral obligations.

(ii) He also speaks of some duties, e.g. judgement, mercy,

[1] Cf. Matt. v. 21–48.
[2] Stevens, *Theology of New Testament*, p. 19.
[3] *American S.S. Times*, January 15, 1910.
[4] Mark vii. 5, 9, 13; Matt. xv. 2, 3, 6.

and faith, as 'weightier matters of the Law' than tithing, 'mint, anise, and cummin.'[1]

(iii) He even goes so far as to suggest that with His advent and new teaching the work of the Law may have served its purpose and should forthwith disappear.[2]

(iv) In regard to certain commands respecting killing, adultery, swearing, revenge, loving, and hating,[3] Jesus offered serious and penetrating criticisms.

From this wide field of criticism we select two matters: viz. 'Sabbath Observance' and the 'Ritual Law' for more detailed consideration.

Re the Sabbath. If John's Gospel may be included, there were six encounters between the Pharisees[4] and Jesus on this subject: (1) When His disciples plucked ears of corn on the Sabbath[5]; (2) when Jesus healed the man with the withered hand in the Synagogue[6]; (3) at the cure of the afflicted woman, also in the Synagogue[7]; (4) the dropsical man in the Pharisee's house[8]; (5) The man at the Pool of Bethesda[9]; and (6) the man blind from birth.[10] The first, it will be noted, is the only case in which personal benefit accrued, and then, apparently, to the disciples, not to Jesus Himself.

The Pharisees' complaint was the same in all the cases: plucking corn, healing the sick, carrying a bed after the cure, were violations of the Sabbath Law which forbade all work on that day. The Jewish interpretations, developments, and safeguards of the Fourth Commandment had grown to such enormous proportions that they 'made their rules on the subject a byword for extravagance and absurdity. Two entire treatises of the Mishnah, Shabbath and Erubin, as well as parts of others, are devoted to provisions for the observance of the Sabbath; and there are also long discussions on the subject, with quotations of the divergent opinions of different Rabbis, in the Gemara.'[11] The Mishnah lays down no fewer than

[1] Luke xi. 42; Matt. xxiii. 23.

[2] Mark ii. 21 f.; Matt. ix. 17; Luke v. 37; Matt. xi. 12 f.; Luke xvi. 16; Matt. xiii. 52.

[3] Matt. v. 21–48.

[4] In two of these cases the Pharisees are not mentioned by name, though they are probably meant.

[5] Mark ii. 23–28; Matt. xii. 1–8; Luke vi. 1–5.

[6] Mark iii. 1–6; Matt. xii. 9–14; Luke vi. 6–11.

[7] Luke xiii. 10–17.

[8] Luke xiv. 1–6.

[9] John v. 2–18.

[10] John ix. 1–41.

[11] Driver, *H. D. B.*, iv. 320.

thirty-nine principal classes of prohibitions, and from these many others are deduced. As might be supposed, the Shammaite section excelled in severity, and according to their view, it was a violation of the sacred day even to tend or console the sick.[1] The burden of these elaborate restrictions became in time so unbearable that many liberating permissions were granted by the Pharisees, some of them extremely ridiculous, which expose their fundamental failure to maintain the desired sanctity of the day.

In His answers to His accusers, Jesus in no way calls in question the authority of the Written Law, nor did He in fact believe that He had violated it. He never used the Sabbath for personal gratification or ordinary pleasure, but, like other Jews, attended the Temple or Synagogue services on that day. His defence on being challenged was, first, that, in regard to the plucking of ears of corn, His disciples were justified by the case of David in the Old Testament and the practice of the priests in the Temple.[2] Secondly, as regards His chief offence —the healing of the sick—He claimed that the purpose of the Law is to serve and not injure the real interests of men, a view which the Jews themselves accepted when their own property was in jeopardy[3]; and He, on His part, only claimed the right of applying the same interpretation to the advantage of suffering humanity. Thirdly, He turned in disgust from all their peddling restrictions to point out the ultimate purpose of the day: the Sabbath was made for man and not man for the Sabbath.[4] And if, as I. Abrahams asserts, an almost identical affirmation was made later by two Tannaim, Simon b. Menasya and Jonathan b. Joseph,[5] Jesus receives unexpected vindication at the hands of wiser Rabbis later on.

The writer just named, on a later page, sums up his discussion of the matter in the following terms: 'The Pharisees permitted, nay required, the performance of all necessary works of mercy, but refused to extend the licence too indiscriminately'; 'Jesus, however, traverses the Pharisaic position, in that He had no objection to treat long-standing diseases, lingering maladies, and, in general, cases where the treatment could be postponed without fear of dangerous consequences.'[6] The latter remark, as a statement of fact,

[1] *Tract. Shabbath*, xii. 1. [2] Mark ii. 25 f.; Matt. xii. 1–5. [3] Luke xiii. 15.
[4] Mark ii. 27. [5] *Studies in Phar. and Gosp.*, p. 130. [6] Ibid., p. 133.

may pass, but there is no evidence that Jesus did extend the licence to perform necessary works of mercy 'too indiscriminately.' In all cases He found Himself faced with the alternative either to heal or to refuse to heal; He never sought out such cases for the purpose of showing contempt for the Sabbath Law; and His presence in any one place was usually of short duration. His question to His critics: 'Is it lawful on the Sabbath day to do good, or to do harm? To save life or to kill?'[1] admitted of only one answer among humane men. And it may be freely admitted that Jesus seems to have held the opinion that the existing regulations, so far from serving the real interests of the Sabbath, were actually doing it a serious disservice, and that to save it a new conception of its use was necessary.[2] Over against the statement of I. Abrahams may be set that of Montefiore: 'We can, I think, see that dialectically the Rabbis were in the right. But we can also perceive that Jesus was in the right, too, and that His right was higher and more permanent than the dialectical right of the Rabbis. Jesus probably realized the absurdity of many of the regulations about the Sabbath into which the Rabbis, in their mistaken zeal and too eager legalism, had unfortunately been led. . . . Jesus may have feared that the very spirit and object of the Sabbath were likely to be crushed out by such casuistical details. Rules would destroy principles.'[3]

Re Ritual Ablutions. The occasions of controversy on ritual cleansing are two in number: (*a*) Mark vii. 1–23, par. Matt. xv. 1–20; and (*b*) Luke xi. 37–41. In the former case 'the Pharisees and the Scribes (who had come from Jerusalem) ask Him, Why walk not Thy disciples according to the Tradition of the Elders, but eat their bread with defiled hands?' In the second case, Jesus was dining in a Pharisee's house and His host 'marvelled that He had not first washed before dinner.' Mark explains, for his Gentile readers, the ground of the accusation: 'For the Pharisees, and all the Jews, except they wash their hands diligently (or, up to the elbow, or, with the fist), eat not, holding the Tradition of the Elders; and when they come from the market-place, except they wash themselves, they eat not: and many other things there be,

[1] Mark iii. 4. [2] Mark ii. 27 f.
[3] *Relig. Teaching of Jesus*, p. 42 f.; cf. *Syn. Gos.*, i. 92 f., ii. 966 f., 974.

which they have received to hold, washings of cups, and pots, and brazen vessels.'

The dispute was inevitable because of the large and important place such practices held in Judaism. Of the six Books of the Mishnah, the largest, called 'Purifications' (טהרות), containing twelve treatises, is devoted to this subject. The object aimed at was not physical cleanliness, but ceremonial purity, and at the root of this was the Pharisees' consciousness of 'separateness' from unholy men and things. The Pentateuch itself contains very elaborate regulations for the maintenance of this idea in everyday life, and the Elders had increased the number considerably. Doubtless there were varying degrees of obedience to these requirements among the contemporaries of Jesus, but the stricter Pharisees at any rate were scrupulous to a fault. Some would wash twice before a meal, also after it, and some even between the courses.

It is not surprising to find that Jesus did not conform at all times to an external form of purity of this nature. Yet He did not volunteer any adverse opinion on these practices until attacked. To do otherwise would have been alien to His method. Whatever the habits of His earlier manhood, during the years of His ministry He appears to have treated the ceremonial system of Judaism with silent respect. At no time did He oppose the sacrifices of the Temple; He paid the Temple tribute, 'lest we should cause them to stumble.'[1] and bade the healed leper show himself to the priest and offer the usual gift.[2] It may be true to say: 'At one stroke He repealed all the Levitical rules as to unclean meats. There can be no such thing as ceremonial, there is only moral, defilement.'[3] But this is rather a generalization deduced from His argument in response to attack, than an indication of His customary practice. Otherwise there would have been no such instances of compliance as those just named, and the complaints against Him would have been more numerous.

The fuller reply of Jesus to the complaint of the Pharisees may be summarized as follows: (1) Emphasis on ceremonialism leads in point of fact to the substitution of outward for inward obedience to the divine will. And history has gone to show the continual danger of ceremonialism degenerating into a pretence of religion or, to use the word of Jesus, hypocrisy.

[1] Matt. xvii. 27. [2] Luke v. 14. [3] Peake, *H. D. B.*, iv. 834 *a*.

(2) While never denying that religion ought to develop, He maintained and taught that the Traditions the Jews had received from their Fathers, so far from being in the line of progress, marked in some respects a decadence. The Moral Law had become subordinate to the Ceremonial Law, as for instance in the way in which the Fifth Commandment was defeated by the power of 'Corban.' (3) Finally, in regard to the age-long question of the relative importance of the inner and outer elements in religion and their value to God and man, Jesus emphatically calls upon His hearers to give the foremost place to the former and reproaches the leaders of the people with blindness because of their preference for the latter.

In recent years Jewish writers have striven hard to justify Judaism against the strictures of Jesus on this subject. Büchler[1] declines to accept the statements of Mark's Gospel at their surface value. 'The practice described by Mark can only have been that of priests, and not of lay Jews . . . scholars have formed an utterly erroneous view of the extent to which the rules of purification were observed in Galilee and in Judea in the times of Jesus.' Montefiore[2] also denies the truth of Mark's picture of the multitude of ablutions. The only occasion on which anything like the bathing of the body was required was, so he says, before a worshipper entered the Temple. He further denies that Mark's statement regarding 'Corban' is true to fact. In both denials he bases himself mainly on the authority of Schechter.[3] Probably one concession may be made to this defence. In describing the general practice of ablutions Mark ascribes them to 'the Pharisees and all the Jews' (οἱ γὰρ φαρισαῖοι κ ὶ πάντες οἱ ἰουδαῖοι), and Büchler takes exception to the word 'all" (πάντες). It seems more than probable that the word is merely used rhetorically, and nothing is lost if it be interpreted as meaning 'large numbers of' or 'the Jews as a whole.' But with the best possible desire to see the matter from a Jewish point of view, there seems no sufficient reason for further concessions. (1) Jewish writers seem to overlook the fact that as an historical document Mark's Gospel occupies a much higher rank than the Talmud, on which they base their arguments. (2) Nor is

[1] *Expos. Times*, xxi. 34 ff.
[2] Art., *Hibbert Journal*, Jan. 1903, and *Syn. Gos.*, i. 160 ff.
[3] App. on 'Legal Evasions of the Law,' Montefiore's *Hibbert Lect.*, 1903.

there any justification for assuming falsification or even exaggeration by Mark; one who was writing in the interest of extra-Palestine converts had no end to serve by exaggerating the malpractices of Jews thirty years before. (3) It is far from improbable that when the Talmud assumed written form the changed conditions of the scattered Jews, who had lost the focal point of their ceremonialism long before this, and the strong if unacknowledged influence of Christianity upon their religion, had together modified to a considerable extent their practices in these matters, with the result that the extremes condemned by Jesus had disappeared.

In a later reference, Montefiore[1] summarizes the discussion in his usual magnanimous way: 'Nothing could defile a man religiously except his own consciously committed sin. It (viz. the statement of Jesus) was a noble, a liberating utterance. When we remember the immense burden which material conceptions of clean and unclean had imposed upon humanity in earlier primitive religions . . . can we laud too highly, can we appreciate too gratefully, the grand and prophetic principle that only that which comes out of a man can make him unclean? . . . Yet highly as we may rate the religious excellence of the saying, entirely as we sympathize with the doctrine, it is impossible not to realize that, given the divinity and perfection of the Law, the utterance of Jesus could not be regarded as either true or inspired.' This is, perhaps, as far as one could expect a Jewish writer to go, and the only remark that need be made is that, however divine and perfect the Law may have been, in Jesus Himself and in the principle He enunciated the world found what was even more divine and perfect, and that the greater light eclipsed the lesser.

3. *His Personal Claims.*

However great the opposition to Jesus on the grounds already named, it was greatly intensified by the prevailing impression that the teacher claimed to be no ordinary person. Nor does popularity in the early stage of His ministry explain this widespread feeling. In point of fact, He did not seek popularity, at least in the usual way or in the usual sense of the word. But far beyond His reported deeds and words His personality laid extraordinary hold of the popular imagination, and from time to time the people's expectations regarding

[1] *Relig. Teaching of Jesus*, p. 48 f.

Him were more than a little alarming to the authorities. What His claims actually were His opponents endeavoured to elicit from His own lips, but it was evidently His plan to suggest these by personal influence rather than to announce them in express statements. Yet they emerged in course of time, and only served to increase antagonism.

As we are only concerned here with Christ's claims as they brought Him into opposition with the Pharisees, this necessitates the exclusion of such as were divulged to His intimates only and did not come to the ears of the outside world. These claims were tacit as well as explicit, and quite likely the former were as irritating and disconcerting to the Pharisees as the latter—possibly more so.

(*a*) *His Claim to Forgive Sins.*—In two instances this claim was plainly made, and on each occasion aroused opposition. The first was in the case of the paralytic let down through the roof of the house,[1] recorded in almost identical language by the three Synoptists. In Mark and Matthew the objectors were the 'Scribes,' in Luke they are called, first, 'Pharisees and Doctors of the Law,' and, later, 'Scribes.' The charge they made was that as God only could forgive sins, Jesus was guilty of blasphemy. In the second case, recorded by Luke only,[2] forgiveness is bestowed on the woman who was a sinner, and the incident occurred in a Pharisee's house. We may fairly assume that those 'that sat at meat with Him' were Pharisees, like their host, but how far the opposition went we are not told beyond the question: 'Who is this that even forgiveth sins?'

That Jesus should claim the 'power' (ἐξουσία) on earth to forgive sins was naturally a great difficulty to the Scribes and Pharisees, and their charge of blasphemy is not surprising. 'According to Rabbinical teaching sin can be taken away by three things: Good Deeds, Repentance, and Confession.'[3] One Jewish writer, Morris Joseph, gives an unexpectedly harsh representation of Judaism on this subject: 'Changefulness such as the notion of pardon would attribute to Him (i.e. God) is inconceivable in the Perfect One. If He knows not the feeling of anger, He knows not the feeling involved in forgiveness. The only reconciliation possible for us si

[1] Mark ii. 3–12; Matt. ix. 2–8; Luke v. 17–26. [2] Luke vii. 47 f.
[3] Oesterley, *Relig. and Worship of Synagogue*, p. 244 (1st ed.).

self-reconciliation.'[1] Other Jewish writers would doubtless repudiate this view. Kohler and Schechter, for instance, represent God as being very willing to forgive. The apparently easy method of forgiveness adopted by Jesus was not, however, the chief point of difficulty, but rather that a mere man should have dared to grant it.

A. B. Bruce[2] and A. H. M'Neile[3] would escape the difficulty by making Jesus merely the interpreter of God's will to forgive. But this would not have called forth so severe a comment from the Scribes. Moreover, the two acts of forgiveness and healing are kindred manifestations of power (or authority) by Jesus. To make the one a mere proclamation and the other a dynamic is hardly consistent exegesis. Further, had Jesus meant no more than what Bruce and M'Neile assert, He would have eased the situation greatly by making this clear to His opponents, and in refraining from doing so He justifies the Scribal assumption of the vast significance of His claim. Godet, Lagrange, Swete, Gould, Plummer, Klostermann, and others, take this, the usual, view. Montefiore puts it tersely when he says: 'The only question at issue between Jesus and the Rabbis was whether *any man* had power to say, "Thy sins are forgiven." '[4]

The same writer puts the general position in a way to which no exception can properly be taken, though a Christian writer would draw a different conclusion: 'Were the Scribes right in saying that Jesus blasphemed? On the hypothesis that Jesus was God, or a part of God, they were not. But as they could not know this, and as they would have refused to believe it, whatever miracles Jesus might have performed, I am inclined to think that from their point of view they were justified.'[5] Others of Christ's contemporaries, with the same facts before them, but without the same unwillingness to modify their preconceptions, reached a different conclusion, and one may suppose that with less bias and minds more open to conviction even the Scribes might have been less precipitate in their condemnation.

(*b*) *To Possess Peculiar Authority.*—Apart altogether from the implied claims made by Jesus, there was an unmistakable air of authority in His whole demeanour which was calculated to

[1] Quoted by Oesterley, op. cit., p. 254. [2] *E. G. T.*, p. 148.
[3] *Com. Matt.*, ad loc. [4] *Syn. Gos.*, i. 79. [5] *Syn. Gos.*, i. 77.

disturb and anger His opponents. However unintentional this effect—and no one would suggest that He intended to provoke those whom He wished to win—it was in the nature of the case inevitable. A few instances of its occurrence are narrated by the Synoptists, but it was much more a permeating spirit, never absent in His treatment of man or religion. Whether the subject under discussion was the Torah as a whole, forgiveness of sins, divorce, the Sabbath, or the questions and problems of particular people, His attitude was always the same: consciously authoritative.

Again omitting all reference to cases which were more or less private, and therefore may not have reached the ears of the Scribes and Pharisees, the following instances may be noted. On one occasion, after teaching in the Synagogue, the people 'were astonished at His teaching: for He taught them as having authority, and not as the Scribes'[1]; which means that while their teaching was based wholly on Torah, His was the result of personal discernment or direct inspiration. Similar testimony is given by Matthew[2] at the close of the Sermon on the Mount. But it was not His teaching only. His power over 'unclean spirits' was of like nature: 'With authority He commandeth even the unclean spirits, and they obey Him.'[3] Nor was it merely *what* He said and did, but the *manner* of His saying and doing it and the implication behind His words and actions, which produced amazement among the people and resentment among His opponents. The question put to Him towards the end of His life by chief priests, Scribes and Elders: 'By what authority doest Thou these things, or who gave Thee this authority to do these things?' must have hovered on their lips from early days. All His words and actions struck them as possessing an independence and lack of hesitancy not only unusual, but irreverent.

Even had the Scribes and Pharisees agreed with His views, they must have resented this element in His life. As Herford puts it: 'The point at which distrust of, and uneasiness about, Jesus first entered the minds of the Pharisees is probably indicated by the saying that He taught them as one having authority and not as their Scribes.' . . . 'To the Pharisees He appears as a sort of unregistered practitioner, if the comparison may be allowed.' . . . 'The attitude of the Pharisees towards

[1] Mark i. 22. [2] Matt. vii. 28 f. [3] Mark i. 27; Luke iv. 36.

Jesus . . . was a shrinking fear of a teacher who, with holy and good words and deeds, seemed yet to be leading them away from the only ideal they could recognize (i.e. the religion of the Torah). And leading not only them, but also the people, who were less able to guard against the danger.'[1] When, therefore, we add to their disagreement with so many of Christ's doctrines this utter dislike of His assumptions as teacher and man, unfriendliness and opposition are not to be wondered at. But it should be noted that there was on the part of Jesus a genuine and sympathetic understanding of the difficulty felt by His opponents. At the conclusion of St. Luke's account of a statement made on this subject, he records a pregnant and tolerant utterance by this strange innovator Himself: 'No man having drunk old wine desireth new: for he saith, the old is good.'[2] Would that there had been equal tolerance on the other side!

(*c*) *To be the Messiah.*—Not until the very end of His life did Jesus avow Himself, at least in public, to be the Messiah. And even then it was only in answer to direct questions on the part of the Jewish and Roman authorities.

But not improbably the idea gained currency at a much earlier period that Jesus really was, in fact if not in words, making this claim. His preaching in the Nazareth Synagogue,[3] His critics' demand for a 'sign,'[4] and, above all, the extraordinary demonstration when He last entered Jerusalem,[5] all point in this direction. But the difference between His opponents' conception of the Messiah and His own was so fundamental as to have rendered any claim on His part of no value either to them or His cause. He had simply to wait the course of events, and meantime prepare the minds of His followers for the subsequent disclosure.

At His trial this need for secrecy had disappeared, and once the affirmation was made all hope of reconciliation vanished in a flash. First, He was challenged by the high-priest in the preliminary examination before the Sanhedrin, in the presence of chief priests, Elders and Scribes. There He declared that He was 'the Christ, the Son of the Blessed,' and that they would 'see the Son of Man sitting at the right hand of power,

[1] *Pharisaism*, pp. 130 f., 140.
[2] Luke v. 39.
[3] Mark vi. 1–6; Matt. xiii. 54–58; Luke iv. 17–30.
[4] E.g. Mark viii. 11.
[5] Mark xi. 10, and pars.

and coming with the clouds of heaven.'[1] This the high-priest characterized as 'blasphemy,' 'and they all condemned Him to be worthy of death.' In the second or real trial, Pilate, instructed, no doubt, by the Sanhedrin, and giving Christ's claim its current political signification, asked his prisoner: 'Art thou the King of the Jews? and He answering saith unto him, Thou sayest.'[2]

If one ask why the Pharisees, who so greatly desired the advent of the Messiah, should have treated so summarily the claims of Jesus, Herford provides a sufficient answer: 'Their position would be that a man who set Himself against the Torah could not be the Messiah. Conceivably the Messiah might in some respects supersede the Torah, but He could never oppose it.' 'The question (whether He was the Messiah) was only put to Him directly by the high-priest at the trial, and therefore not by the Pharisees at all. And it is scarcely likely to have been put then as a challenge to argument; it was much more an attempt to get evidence on which to convict Him out of His own mouth.'[3]

(*d*) *To Enjoy a Special Relation with God.*—Here, as before, we must avoid all private and confidential conversations between Jesus and His disciples, which probably remained a sacred and secret possession. Nor is it necessary to discuss the precise significance of such a term as 'Son of God,' which came to be associated with His person. Enough that, however it arose, it was understood to signify a relationship towards God quite different from that in which other men stood.

On three occasions His enemies accused Him of blasphemy, two being recorded in the Synoptics, and one in the Fourth Gospel. Of the two former, one was due to His claiming the right to forgive sin,[4] and the other followed His statement to the high-priest at His trial: 'Ye shall see the Son of Man sitting at the right hand of power, and coming with the clouds of heaven.'[5] In the one case He was making Himself equal with God, for 'who can forgive sins but one, even God?'; in the other, He described His own future glory, and so His real relationship to God, in a way which was certainly either blasphemous or simply true.

[1] Mark xiv. 61 f. [2] Mark xv. 2.
[3] *Pharisaism*, p. 42 f.; cf. Montefiore, *Syn. Gos.*, I. lxxxviii. f.
[4] Mark ii. 7, and pars. [5] Mark xiv. 62 f., and pars.

The other claims already named, e.g. to be the Messiah and to possess special authority as Teacher, also imply special relations with God. For, to take the latter only, as being the less obvious, what right had any mere man to attempt to correct and remodel the Torah, or even to say, 'Ye have heard that it was said to them of old time . . . but I say unto you'?[1] It could only find justification in a very high personal claim, and probably this was the Teacher's way of suggesting the idea.

The same impression is conveyed by many other words on public occasions. For example, in the parable of the vineyard, His hearers quickly discerned 'that He spake the parable against them,'[2] and they would not be slow to identify the 'beloved son' sent by 'the lord of the vineyard' with the speaker Himself. There is also a striking passage in Matthew, which if spoken publicly, must have arrested attention: 'Not every one that saith unto Me Lord, Lord, shall enter into the kingdom of heaven; but he that doeth the will of My Father which is in heaven.'[3] And though it is recorded in a less impressive form by Luke,[4] Mark places the speaker's claim on a similar basis when he reports Him as saying: 'For whosoever shall do the will of God, the same is My brother and sister and mother.'[5] A further saying, of tremendous import and spoken in the presence of 'the many thousands of the multitude,[6] could have left little doubt in the minds of the Pharisees of the high personal pretensions of the speaker: 'And I say unto you, every one who shall confess Me before men, him shall the Son of Man confess before the angels of God: but he that denieth Me in the presence of men shall be denied in the presence of the angels of God.'[7] In these cases no special Messianic term is relied on to express the dignity of His person, but perhaps all the more for that reason did the underlying assumption sink into the consciousness of His hearers, friends and foes alike.

The extraordinary exclamations of those possessed by unclean spirits when brought into contact with Jesus must have been reported to those who were watching His movements. 'Thou art the Son of God,' 'Thou Son of God,' 'Thou Son of the Most High'[8]—such were their extraordinary testimonies.

[1] Matt. v., passim. [2] Mark xii. 12. [3] Matt. vii. 21. [4] Luke vi. 46.
[5] Mark iii. 35. [6] Luke xii. 1. [7] Luke xii. 8; cf. Matt. x. 32 f.
[8] Mark iii. 11; Matt. viii. 29; Luke iv. 41, viii. 28.

The gathering storm of indignation consequent on this high claim burst in fury at the trial when Caiaphas demanded: 'Art thou the Christ, the Son of the Blessed?'[1] And on His avowal, 'the high-priest rent his clothes' in token of his horror at the blasphemy. That this claim was a matter of common report is shown by some of the incidents at the cross. The passers-by ironically bade Him save Himself if He were 'the Son of God,' while the centurion and others more soberly declared: 'Truly this was the Son of God.'[2]

There can be no doubt, therefore, that the antagonism of the authorities, ending in His death, was largely due to His personal claims. His other offences, great as they were, might have been overlooked as unworthy in themselves of official notice, but they were not to be tolerated from one who claimed Messiahship and an intimate relationship with God.

How their Opposition showed Itself.

The Pharisees found themselves in a difficult position. They were convinced that Jesus must be opposed and, in some way, ultimately destroyed. But to accomplish this the general support of the people was requisite, yet with the people Jesus was for long extremely popular. Hence the cautious and stealthy movements of so powerful a body against an isolated individual, with no party and only a small and varying following. Their methods are not difficult to trace.

From time to time they appointed delegations, mainly from Jerusalem, to watch Jesus, criticize Him when opportunity served, and do all they could to counteract His influence over the people. The members of these bands are described variously as Pharisees, Scribes, and Doctors of the Law, and though the last two classes may have included Sadducees the general attitude taken was identical with that of the Pharisees. Examples of these visits will suffice. (*a*) When the palsied man let through the roof by his friends was forgiven, we are told by Mark that the criticism which ensued came from the Scribes who were already sitting in the house.[3] Luke is fuller, and tells us that 'there were Pharisees and Doctors of Law sitting by, which were come out of every village of Galilee and Judea and Jerusalem.'[4] Their reason for pushing their

[1] Mark xiv. 61 f.; cf. Matt. xxvi. 64; Luke xxii. 70.
[2] Matt. xxvii. 40, 43, 54. [3] Mark ii. 6. [4] Luke v. 17.

way into the crowded house can hardly be in doubt. (*b*) In the Synagogue, when on the Sabbath Jesus healed the man with the withered hand, Mark says that 'they watched Him . . . that they might accuse Him,'[1] and this is confirmed by Matthew[2] and Luke.[3] That the watchers were Pharisees is told us by Mark later on. Similar acts of espionage are recorded elsewhere by Luke,[4] so that the practice evidently became quite common. (*c*) The complaint that the disciples of Jesus 'ate their bread with defiled, that is, unwashen hands' proceeded from a similar band who had come from Jerusalem.[5] (*d*) Even the terrible charge that Jesus was in league with Beelzebub had the same origin.[6] And if in Luke's account his phrase 'some of them'[7] is to be read as indicating that the 'people' too made this gross allegation, it goes to show how well the multitude had learned to copy their instructors.

The fact and character of the antagonism are further seen in the underlying aim and temper of their conversations and disputes with Jesus, which not infrequently became malignant. Of these a few instances may be given:

(*a*) The demand for a 'sign' in the mouth of some men might have revealed a genuine willingness to be convinced, but their object was to 'tempt' Him, with the result that, instead of gratifying, it depressed and angered the Teacher.[8]

(*b*) The spirit which prompted the 'Beelzebub' accusation[9] was not only evil but foolish, and Christ's exposure of its utter feebleness was unhesitating and complete. Its inspiration was a desperate determination to poison utterly all popular confidence in Him.

(*c*) The discussion on divorce which they introduced[10] was undeniably clever, but again they were only 'tempting him,' as both Mark and Matthew point out. It was a deeply laid plot, and contained two dangers into one or both of which they hoped their victim might fall. 'This question of divorce was one of the puzzles of the schools, arising from the ambiguity of the Law.'[11] If He decided on the stricter view it would possibly embroil Him with Herod Antipas,[12] and, indeed,

[1] Mark iii. 2. [2] Matt. xii. 10. [3] Luke vi. 7.
[4] Luke xiv. 1; xx. 20. [5] Mark vii. 1; Matt. xv. 1. [6] Mark iii. 22.
[7] Luke xi. 15. [8] Mark viii. 11; Matt. xvi. 1; cf. Matt. xii. 38 f.
[9] Mark iii. 22; Matt. xii. 24; Luke xi. 14; Matt. ix. 34.
[10] Mark x. 2; Matt. xix. 3. [11] Gould, *Com. Marc, I. C. C.*, p. 182 f.
[12] So Swete and Lagrange, *Coms.*, ad loc.

any definite opinion either way would involve Him in a dispute with the followers of either Shammai or Hillel, who were on opposite sides. It is of course absurd to suppose that His questioners attached the least weight to His view, save for the purposes of their polemic.

(*d*) The question concerning paying 'tribute' to Caesar[1] stands in the same category. As the Evangelists state, His opponents merely sought to 'catch,' 'ensnare,' or 'take hold of' Him, and they properly stigmatize it as 'hypocrisy' and 'craftiness.' What else could it be? As before, it is inconceivable that they cared in the least degree for His opinion on such a point.

That the Pharisees decided, even at a very early stage, on the destruction of Jesus, and were largely responsible for His death, seems the only legitimate interpretation of the Synoptic evidence. Their alliance with the Herodians[2] was in itself of sinister significance. The interests of the two parties were strikingly different, and for the Pharisees to accept association with men whose aims were purely political and who were unlikely to be over-scrupulous in their methods, is evidence of the lengths to which they were prepared to go. Moreover, we are told definitely by Mark and Matthew[3] of their intention to 'destroy' Jesus, and the words of Luke, though different, are of the same tenor: 'They were filled with madness; and communed one with another what they might do to Jesus.' Luke tells us, too, how on one occasion the Pharisees themselves appeared to play the part of solicitous protectors of Jesus, warning Him to quit Herod's dominions lest the Tetrarch should slay Him.[4] The reception they received does not suggest that they deceived their intended victim, and Plummer's explanation of their seeming friendship is probably not far from the truth. 'The Pharisees wanted to frighten Jesus into Judea, where He would be more in the power of the Sanhedrin.'[5] The irony of Christ's reply is quite in harmony with this suggestion: 'It cannot be that a prophet perish out of Jerusalem.'[6] That the Pharisees were angry ('moved with indignation,' says Matthew) at the demonstration of the children and others when Jesus made His great Messianic entry into Jerusalem

[1] Mark xii. 13 ff., and pars.
[2] Mark iii. 6; Matt. xii. 14.
[3] Mark iii. 6, xii. 13; Matt. xxii. 16.
[4] Luke vi. 11, xiii. 31.
[5] *Com. Luke, I.C.C.*, ad loc
[6] Luke xiii. 33.

was natural enough, and equally so their demand for evidence of His authority as He taught in the Temple.[1]

Chwolson[2] and others would lay the entire responsibility for the death of Jesus on the Sadducean party. But this is to overlook all the foregoing facts, which show that the final tragedy was only the culmination of a long campaign of opposition which the Pharisaic party had skilfully engineered.[3] Their astuteness in so arranging the final episode that the high-priestly party filled the chief rôle as accusers, while they themselves retired into the background, cannot obliterate the traces of their crafty workmanship. Those who 'sought to lay hold on Him' after hearing His parable of the Vineyard must have included Pharisees.[4] Nor is anything less open to doubt than that among the final plotters against Him, i.e. chief priests, Scribes and Elders, a fair representation of Pharisees would be found in the two latter classes.[5] In the preliminary trial before Caiaphas they would be present as members of the Sanhedrin. And when we are informed in Matthew[6] that the Pharisees, after the Crucifixion, appealed to Pilate to safeguard the sepulchre of their victim, the statement, though unsupported elsewhere, is entirely consonant with the often-expressed determination of their party to put an end to the pretensions of the Galilean Prophet. They had plotted His destruction, and, whoever were the actual instruments of its accomplishment, a large measure of responsibility must be laid at the Pharisees' door.

II. Attitude of Jesus to the Pharisees

This has already been alluded to in the preceding portion of this chapter, but only incidentally. In parrying the Pharisees' attacks on Himself Jesus was obliged to disclose His views on their system as a whole. But this represents in a very fragmentary way His fundamental criticism of the Pharisaism of His time. With certain individual Pharisees He seems to have been on quite friendly terms, as, for instance, Simon the Pharisee, Nicodemus, and Joseph of Arimathea, but they were the exception. His quarrel was with typical Pharisees and Pharisaism.

[1] Luke xx. 2.
[2] *Das letzte Passamahl Christi.*
[3] Mark iii. 6; Matt. xii. 14; Mark xiv. 1; Luke xx. 20.
[4] Mark xii. 12; cf. xi. 27, with Matt. xxi. 45 and Luke xx. 19.
[5] Mark xiv. 1; Matt. xxvi. 3; Luke xxii. 2.
[6] Matt. xxvi. 62 f.

Some writers express regret that Jesus should have assumed the rôle of critic at all, even of Pharisaism. Whether He would have done so if the Pharisees had not definitely challenged Him it is impossible to say, but it is difficult to see how He could have avoided it. Moreover, we doubt whether this dislike of criticism found in some circles to-day is altogether wholesome. Admittedly, criticism has often been harsh and barren, undiscriminating and tyrannical, in religion as in other matters, but none the less it has been one of the great instruments of progress in art, science, literature, and politics ; and to forbid it in matters of religion would only tend to prolong needlessly the prevalence of error and hypocrisy. We see no necessity, therefore, to apologize for the fact that Jesus criticized the Pharisees, any more than that they criticized Him. On either side it was an obligation imposed by conviction. The spirit, substance, and value of the criticism are of course quite another matter. We have already noted the nature of the Pharisees' criticism of Jesus and attempted to assess its value ; we have now to attempt a similar task in regard to His criticism of them.

1. *Antagonism Inevitable.*—In the first place, it must be frankly admitted that with such different conceptions of religion antagonism was inevitable from the outset.

Pharisaism was pre-eminently a religion of Law. This is not disputed by modern Jewish writers ; they avow it and are proud of it. The Torah was God's final revelation, and would never be superseded ; it was too intimately related to God ever to be separated from Him ; through obedience to its precepts man obtains salvation ; and it was the supreme and peculiar treasure of the Jewish race.[1] But along with the nobler results of this faith, and they were many, there had crept in, by general admission, much formalism and externalism. Religion had lost its simplicity and spontaneity and hardened in the direction of scrupulous observances, and it is difficult to see how this could have been avoided. Jewish writers may plead that the Law must not be blamed for this degeneration of its representatives, but it must be remembered that the reformer is bound to face the actual, not the ideal. This is indeed acknowledged by Montefiore : ' The tendency of the Pharisees and Rabbis was to interpret the Law more and more strictly, and to increase the wall of legal severance which separated the

[1] Oesterley and Box, *Relig. and Worship of the Syn.*, chap. vii.

Jew from the Gentile. It would be unfair to say that the Rabbis deliberately extended the ceremonial at the expense of the moral Law, but it is true to say that their devotion to the non-moral side of the Law did occasionally produce evil results on the moral and spiritual side both in themselves and in their followers.'[1] Such a perversion inevitably produced a certain type of man, and it was this typical man whom Jesus encountered.

It would be difficult to imagine a greater contrast in religious types, among men who held so much in common, than between this type and the new Teacher. The emphasis of Jesus was almost wholly on 'inwardness' and 'spirit.' Not that Pharisaism was fundamentally indifferent to these qualities—certainly many Pharisees were not—but while they trusted in 'obedience' to the Law to induce the true spirit of religion, Jesus placed the true religious spirit first, believing that this would lead to the only 'obedience' acceptable to God. How great was the actual difference between the two types is seen at once when we compare, for instance, the attitude of each to his own 'good deeds.' The Pharisee who prayed so haughtily in the Temple[2] may have been an extreme case, but the common idea that good deeds merited divine favour was an entirely natural deduction from Pharisaic teaching. Jesus, on the other hand, found no 'merit' in human goodness. 'When ye shall have done all the things that are commanded you, say, we are unprofitable servants; we have done that which it was our duty to do'[3]; on God's part were love and grace, and on man's there should be trust and simple, uncalculated obedience. Again, unlike the Pharisees, Jesus laid no stress on the necessity (to goodness) of profound knowledge of the detailed requirements of the Torah—a demand impossible of realization for the majority; hence arose the possibility that all sorts and conditions of men (sinners, the lost, strangers[4]) might respond forthwith to the appeal of the Divine Father and accept the offer of His forgiveness. But the contrasts between the two types were many and various. The Pharisee, on the one hand, was consciously faultless and had little but condemnation for the erring; himself strong, he was unable to understand the weak; exact himself, he became exacting; secure in his own

[1] *Syn. Gos.*, I. lxxviii.
[2] Luke xviii. 9–14.
[3] Luke xvii. 10.
[4] Cf. Matt. xx. 1–16.

rectitude, he troubled little about others' danger; confident of his own merit, he was equally confident of others' demerit; with a goodness which might evoke respect but never love, the qualities of mercy and pity were for the most part wanting. Over against this, Jesus exemplified a goodness which was unconscious of itself, but which breathed its benedictions on the unprivileged and neediest, a spirit whose core was love and so strangely magnetic.

How, then, could it happen otherwise than that the latter mode of life, being both nobler and newer, should lay bare the inherent imperfections of the former, even had it found it at its best? When, however, it actually encountered Pharisaism in some of its haughtiest, most militant and least worthy representatives, the clash of the antagonism was inevitably sharp and painful to both.

2. *The Charges He made against Them.*—These make a formidable list, even when we include only those recorded in the Marcan and Q narratives. Without serious omissions they may be grouped under the following heads: (*a*) excessive legalism and formalism; (*b*) hypocrisy; (*c*) wrong relation to others; and (d) blasphemy against the Holy Spirit.

(*a*) Instances of the first are found in the discussions on 'Washings'[1] and 'Sabbath observance.'[2] In each case, though the discussion originated in the Pharisees finding fault with the practice of Jesus or His disciples, it ended in His charging them with defeating the fundamental purpose of a religious regulation by their blind devotion to ordinances. In the discussion on 'Washings' this is expressed in such passages as: 'Ye leave the commandment of God and hold fast the tradition of men'; 'Making void the Word of God by your tradition which ye have delivered: and many such like things ye do'; and 'there is nothing from without the man, that going into him can defile him: but the things which proceed out of the man are those that defile the man.'[3]

In the controversy on 'Sabbath observance,' it is clear that Jesus takes no exception to the peculiar sacredness which Pharisees and people alike attached to the Sabbath, but rather to their undiscerning interpretation of it. When confronted

[1] Mark vii. 1–23; Matt. xv. 1–20.
[2] Mark ii. 23–iii. 6; Matt. xii. 1–14; Luke vi. 1–11,; xiii. 14–17,; xiv. 1–6.
[3] Mark vii. 8, 13, 15.

with the pathetic appeal of the man having a withered hand, He turned hopefully to the Pharisees for a generous application of the Law. Their dumb, critical immobility stirred Him profoundly: 'He . . . looked round about on them with anger, being grieved at the hardening of their heart.'[1] On other occasions His anger found vent in speech. Thus, to those who had condemned the disciples for picking a few heads of corn on the Sabbath: 'If ye had known what this meaneth, I desire mercy and not sacrifice, ye would not have condemned the guiltless.'[2] Of a severer order are the words of Luke, in reporting a similar incident: 'Ye hypocrites, doth not each one of you on the Sabbath loose his ox or his ass from the stall, and lead him away to watering? And ought not this woman . . . to have been loosed from this bond on the day of the Sabbath?'[3] In maintaining the traditional interpretation of the Law they had lost its spirit and destroyed its purpose.

(*b*) How keenly the second charge of hypocrisy was felt by the Pharisees may be judged from their own denunciation of the Sadducees for this offence in an earlier generation. In the Psalms of Solomon the Pharisaic writer, referring to the rival party, exclaims:

> Let God remove those that live in hypocrisy in the company of the pious,
> (Even) the life of such an one with corruption of his flesh and penury.[4]

To be charged by Jesus with this very vice themselves must have been gall and bitterness. The words 'hypocrisy' (ὑπόκρισις) and 'hypocrite' (ὑποκριτής) mean first 'a reply,' 'an answer' and 'one who answers,' 'an interpreter'; then, 'play-acting' and 'actor'; and from the latter we get the common New Testament significance: 'pretence, dissimulation, and a pretender, dissembler.'[5] There is, therefore, no room to doubt the evil character of the offence with which Jesus charges His opponents. And with the Synoptic material before us it is only too clear that many of the Pharisees were guilty. The cases cited are fairly numerous, but only a few of the best authenticated need be recalled that the reader may

[1] Mark iii. 5. [2] Matt. xii. 7. [3] Luke xiii. 15 f.
[4] Ps. Sol. iv. 7. [5] Cf. *New Testament Lexicons*, Thayer-Grimm, Abbot-Smith.

observe under what varied circumstances the fault showed itself.

In answering His opponents' criticism of His disciples' eating with unwashed hands, Jesus not only repudiates the excessive formalism of the complaint, but stigmatizes the critics as 'hypocrites.'[1] In proof, He points to the way in which they evade obligation of the Fifth Commandment under the specious plea of 'Corban.' Despite their pretended keenness for a purity which should touch even the externals of life, they actually allowed a man to ignore or trample on the deeper and more fundamental instincts and duties of filial relationship. This was not only wrong, but dishonest—a pretence. They were 'playing a part' like an actor, and making a mere pretence of godliness.

When the Pharisees joined hands with the Herodians to question Him about the lawfulness of paying tribute to Cæsar, it was with the idea 'that they might catch Him in talk.' In itself this may have been quite legitimate between opponents. But their pretended esteem for His opinion, which at heart they regarded with contempt, together with their assumed admiration of His independence of judgement, was manifestly 'hypocrisy.'[2] Combining the reports of the Synoptists, Swete remarks: 'Malice (πονηρία) lay at the root of their conduct, unscrupulous cunning (πανουργία) supplied them with the means of seeking their end, whilst they sought to screen themselves under the pretence (ὑπόκρισις) of a desire for guidance and an admiration of fearless truthfulness.'[3] Even Montefiore's comment is not different: 'Jesus recognizes that He is not being asked for the sake of getting at the truth, but in order to trip Him up.'[4] This may be splendid fighting, but it reveals a grave defect of character.

In the next case to be mentioned, found in the 'Sermon on the Mount,' Jesus deals with the tendency to excessive and incessant fault-finding found in certain types of religious people. The Pharisees are not definitely named, but such a question as: 'Why beholdest thou the mote that is in thy brother's eye, but considerest not the beam that is in thine own eye?' could only refer to the Pharisees or their Scribes, or both. And when He characterizes such a man as a 'hypocrite,'[5] He

[1] Mark vii. 6; Matt. xv. 7. [2] Mark xii. 15; Matt. xxii. 18; Luke xx. 20 f.
[3] *Com. Mark*, p. 275. [4] *Syn. Gos.*, i. 280. [5] Matt. vii. 5; Luke vi. 42.

obviously means that such zeal for flawlessness in others, while the critic is in an even worse moral condition himself, was not entirely unconscious. Had the fault-finder's anxiety to remove evil from mankind been genuinely honest, he would have begun with himself. At heart he was insincere.

It cannot be a matter for wonder, therefore, that Jesus warned His disciples to ' beware of the leaven of the Pharisees, which,' as Luke adds, ' is hypocrisy.'[1] In the New Testament ' leaven ' is generally a type of *evil* working silently and secretly, the parable of the Leaven being probably the only exception to this signification. In Mark, the warning follows the Pharisees' demand for ' a sign from heaven, tempting Him,' and is to be regarded as a condemnation of a request which shows how wilfully blind they were to the signs already granted. Matthew's record yields a similar meaning. In Luke, however, it follows a description of the Pharisees' attempt ' to provoke Him to speak of many things ; laying wait for Him, to catch something out of His mouth ' ; and it is immediately followed by the reminder that ' there is nothing covered up, that shall not be revealed ; and hid, that shall not be known.'

The remaining case to be named[2] is represented by Mark and Luke as referring to the Scribes, but here again it is in every way probable that they were the Scribes of the Pharisees. Matthew refers the whole discourse to both Scribes and Pharisees, and though different parts are more applicable to the one than to the other, the section which concerns us here undoubtedly applies to the Pharisees.[3] In this passage, says Gould, Jesus ' charges them with ostentation, an unhealthy craving for position and flattery, and a fearful inconsistency between the profuseness of their worship and the cruel meanness of their lives.'[4] So, too, Lagrange : ' Ce petit discours suffit pour stigmatiser la vanité, l'avarice, et l'hypocrisie des scribes.'[5] The culmination of their guilt is found in the words : ' They . . . for a pretence make long prayers.' To the one who knew the value of the sacred act of prayer as no other man did, who Himself prayed and prayed ' long,' it must

[1] Mark viii. 15 ; Matt. xvi. 6, 11 ; Luke xii. 1.

[2] Mark xii. 38–40 ; Matt. xxiii. 6 f. ; Luke xx. 45 ff.

[3] So Box, ' Scribes and Pharisees,' *Expos.*, VIII. xv. xvi.

[4] *Com. Mark*, p. 237.

[5] ' This little discourse is enough to stigmatize the vanity, avarice, and hypocrisy of the scribes ' (*Com. Marc*, p. 306).

have been an unspeakable offence to encounter so utter a perversion of true religion.

(*c*) Jesus further charged the Pharisees with an attitude to others which was not only mistaken and unworthy, but also a grievous reflection on the essential magnanimity of religious character. This showed itself in a spirit of contempt, censoriousness, prejudice, moral blindness, and craving for external honour. Now, all men will allow that a man's attitude to others, and especially to such as are generally regarded as on a different and lower religious level, is a true and searching test of character. It likewise throws a flood of light on his conception of his religious duties. Should he betray narrowness of outlook, harshness or sternness with no redemptive purpose behind it, a tone of superiority when speaking of even the most abandoned, an unwillingness to readjust himself to fresh and life-giving ideas and spiritual types, he or his religion stands condemned.

Judged by this test the Pharisees failed in their relationship towards *the masses*, who either observed the Law less strictly than themselves or lived evil, careless lives. It was not that they ignored the people. They and their Scribes were their self-appointed teachers, and desired nothing more than to remain so. But when their teaching went unheeded they had no place for tolerance. Possibly they did not grasp the fact that the lives of the masses were so preoccupied with ordinary things, that even with the best of intentions they would have found it extremely difficult, if not impossible, to follow the myriad precepts of their instructors in all points. However this may have been, the Pharisees held the uneducated and unregenerate masses of the population in utter contempt.

The story of the Pharisee and Publican praying in the Temple is a fragment preserved by Luke only,[1] but there is little reason to doubt its genuineness. Montefiore accepts it without hesitation. 'No parable in the Gospels is more characteristic than this. None reflects better an essential feature of the teaching of Jesus. A legal religion has its dangers . . . and what they are is inimitably hit off in this admirable story. It touches the spot; it reveals the sore place. It is true.'[2] Being true we are free to note its description of the Pharisees: they 'trusted in themselves that they were righteous and

[1] Luke xviii. 9–14.

[2] *Syn. Gos.*, ii. p. 1022.

despised others (or, set all others at nought)'; 'God, I thank Thee, that I am not as the rest of men, extortioners, unjust, adulterers, or even as this publican'—all quite true, doubtless, but what can we think of a man who should so contrast himself with others in prayer?

If the Fourth Gospel were available as evidence on the same plane as the Synoptics, we should have at hand a statement in concise form of the general feeling of the Pharisees towards the multitude. Exasperated by the enthusiasm of the people for Jesus, which overawed even the officers of the Law, they exclaimed: 'This multitude which knoweth not the Law are accursed.'[1] The whole chapter, indeed, is of the same tenor. The people had to take their beliefs from those above them, to dare otherwise was to be accursed. When Jesus ventured to eat with 'publicans and sinners,' it placed His reputation in such jeopardy that He had to defend Himself against the Pharisees' onslaught. To us it seems too obvious for remark that a religious teacher should come 'not to call the righteous, but sinners,'[2] but to His self-righteous opponents it was a rock of offence. He could not help a feeling of compassion for the irreligious and neglected masses because 'they were distressed and scattered, as sheep not having a shepherd,'[3] 'the lost sheep of the house of Israel.'[4]

It may appear a curious contradiction that the Pharisees should feel such contempt for those whom they taught, but the contradiction is on the surface only. It has always been the temptation of unsympathetic teachers, who are more interested in their theme than in their pupils, to regard with favour the more docile and receptive and to despise the rest as unfit, and apparently the Pharisees succumbed to this temptation. The indocile 'publicans and sinners' were therefore left to their own devices and allowed to sink even more deeply in their sins.

But the Pharisees were equally wrong in their relationship to the *Baptist* and *Jesus* Himself. At first they were stirred by the temporary popularity which greeted both, and sallied forth with the crowd to examine the new-comers' credentials, but their hesitation was brief and antagonism quickly supervened. In reproachful words, addressed to the multitudes

[1] John vii. 49.
[2] Matt. ix. 13; Luke xv. 7.
[3] Matt. ix. 36.
[4] Matt. x. 6.

indeed, but referring mainly to their Pharisaic leaders,[1] Jesus shows how impossible it was for either the Baptist or Himself to satisfy men who refused to be convinced. 'For John came neither eating nor drinking, and they say, He hath a devil. The Son of Man came eating and drinking, and they say, Behold a gluttonous man and a winebibber, a friend of publicans and sinners.'[2] It was in part due to this attitude of prejudiced opposition that Jesus adopted the parable as His method of instruction. For if the words 'whosoever hath, to him shall be given . . . whosoever hath not, from him shall be taken away even that which he hath,'[3] have reference in the first instance to the multitude, they fit the attitude of the Pharisees more aptly still. In the stubborn refusal of the Pharisees and other authorities to commit themselves to any opinion respecting John's ministry[4] we read their own condemnation. The record betrays no feeling on their part of any possibility of error in their estimates of Jesus and the Baptist, no quiet, unprejudiced examination of facts such as would have been fitting in influential leaders of opinion. Even Nicodemus, the great exception, found it impossible to grasp the meaning of Jesus, so blinded by tradition was he to the deeper things of the spirit. Yet all the time a higher truth was being given to men and a deeper spirituality revealed, as many modern Jews are not afraid to avow. No wonder Matthew preserves the saying of Jesus: 'Let them alone, they are blind guides.'[5]

Towards *Society* as a whole their general attitude was marked by a self-appraisement in which modesty and meekness were conspicuously lacking. Of this the 'Sermon on the Mount' provides abundant evidence. Wherever they went they craved for recognition and honour. Possibly their Scribes were especially blameworthy, but even non-Scribal Pharisees betrayed the same weakness. 'All their works they do for to be seen of men; for they make broad their phylacteries and enlarge the border of their garments, and love the chief place at feasts and the chief seats in the synagogues,' &c.[6]

(*d*) The most terrible charge of all is found in Christ's suggestion that in their attacks upon Him they were *in danger of blaspheming against the Holy Spirit.* One gladly notes that

[1] Cf. Luke vii. 30. [2] Matt. xi. 18 f.; cf. Luke vii. 33 f.
[3] Matt. xiii. 12; cf. xxv. 29; Mark iv. 28; Luke viii. 18, xix. 26.
[4] Mark xi. 27 ff., and pars. [5] Matt. xv. 14. [6] Matt. xxiii. 5 f., and pars.

He does not allege that they had actually committed this sin, but the solemnity of His warning is a clear indication of the gravity of their position. The record is contained in all three Synoptics,[1] and in Mark and Matthew in the same historical setting. Nor is there room for doubt that it is the Pharisees who are referred to. For while Mark names only the Scribes who had come down from Jerusalem, Matthew calls them Pharisees, and Luke introduces the matter with the warning against 'the leaven of the Pharisees, which is hypocrisy.' The 'Scribes' of Mark are manifestly Scribes of the Pharisees. The whole subject has been discussed with such fullness and thoroughness that little need be added here. Moreover, the meaning of the charge seems plain enough. To attack and misrepresent Jesus personally, in all the inevitable limitations of His earthly life, was understandable and not beyond forgiveness, but the same attitude towards the good which showed itself in Him and through Him implied both the perversion of their own sense of goodness and an unwillingness to recognize its divine source. The 'spirit' here 'represents the moral ideal, the absolutely good and holy.'[2] 'To call that evil, instead of good, and especially to ascribe it to the very prince of evil, is the blasphemy against the Holy Spirit.'[3] Montefiore, usually so penetrating and fair, seems to fall below his usual level when he says: 'We disagree with Jesus on this point, though we understand His sensitiveness. To us, who have been taught from our childhood the infinite mercy of God, there can be no sin for which there can be no forgiveness.'[4] He seems to ignore the possibility of invincible blindness and the wilful perversion of one's own moral nature. Yet it was to this danger that the warning of Jesus referred.

3. *The Significance of this Criticism.*—Such, then, being the Synoptist's account of Jesus' criticism of the Pharisees, we are bound to inquire what its implication is. Whether, that is, it is to be regarded as a condemnation of the whole party, or only of certain sections; and whether, in either case, it is fair and reliable. This is only just to a great religious party, and, indeed, the strong protests of most modern Jews against the truth of this criticism cannot and ought not to be

[1] Mark iii. 20–30; Matt. xii. 22–37; Luke xi. 14–26, xii. 1–12.
[2] Bruce, *E. G. T.*, p. 189.
[3] Gould, *Com. Mark*, p. 66; so Lagrange and Swete; also Allen on *Matt.*
[4] *Syn. Gos.*, i. 117.

ignored. Jews have a proper pride in the reputation of that party out of which later Judaism grew, and they regard the usual attitude of the Christian world to the Pharisees as a stigma and a grievance.

(*a*) *Qualifications of the Record or of the Criticism.*—With the scornful, popular view of the Pharisees we need not greatly concern ourselves here. If too unmindful of the virtues of the Pharisees, its detestation of what it takes (or mistakes) to have been Pharisaism is far from unhealthy, and where it does injustice to historic Pharisaism it is for students to correct it. But we doubt whether Christian scholars have ever been so careless as to refer the criticism of Jesus to the whole party of Pharisees without exception. Certainly no modern student would do so. That so great a party should have merited in any degree the trenchant criticisms of the Founder of Christianity is no matter of rejoicing to the modern Christian—quite the reverse. And to discover any mitigation of the condemnation would be more than welcome.

Canon Box, writing on 'Scribes and Sadducees in the New Testament'[1] argues that some confusion has taken place in Matthew's references to Scribes and Pharisees which can only be disentangled by careful comparison with the parallel accounts in the other Synoptics. Special allusion is made to Matthew xxiii., and in this and some other passages his argument that Sadducees are referred to rather than Pharisees would appear to be well founded. On the other hand, we think it may be safely assumed that the Scribes of the Sadducees in attacking Jesus would not defend practices which their own party ignored or treated with a slack hand, and that in such cases the opponents of Jesus were really Scribes of the Pharisees. Moreover, as Canon Box himself states: 'outside the Sanhedrin the great body of the scribal class consisted of members of one or other of the great Rabbinical schools.'[2] As an instance of possible confusion the dispute *re* Tribute Money is examined,[3] the conclusion reached being that the questioners 'must be Sadducean Scribes,' not Pharisaic Scribes. Yet Matthew describes them as Pharisee-disciples and Herodians, and Mark as Pharisees and Herodians. Moreover, the preceding parable of the Wicked Husbandmen was

[1] *Expos.*, VIII. xv., xvi.
[2] Ibid., xvi., p. 58.
[3] Matt. xxii. 15–22; Mark xii. 13–17; Luke xx. 20–26.

addressed to representatives of the Sanhedrin [1] (and thus probably to Sadducees), who, Mark informs us, 'left Him and went away'; [2] and it was then that the Pharisees and Herodians intervened. How Mark could be so misled as to suppose either that the Sanhedrists did not go away, or that the new questioners were identical with the old ones, though called by the name of other parties, is not easy to understand. Admittedly the association of Pharisees with Herodians is extraordinary, as also the pretended interest of the Pharisees in Tribute Money, but bitter antagonism to a common foe has often led men to do unusual and desperate things. We see no sufficient reason, therefore, to doubt Mark's record. Probably we ought to distinguish carefully between the 'senders' of the deputation and the 'sent,' a point which is dealt with in the next chapter.[3] The 'sent' certainly included Pharisees, as stated above, but among the 'senders' were, in all likelihood, Sadducees. If, then, in particular incidents some readjustments are called for, we do not find that the Pharisees have suffered any substantial injustice through inaccuracy in the records.

It ought nevertheless to be borne in mind that the Gospels were not written as an appraisement of the Pharisees. It is not their story which is narrated, but the life of Jesus. And though their antagonism to Him occupies an important place in the record, only such mention is made of them as is necessary to elucidate the principles and struggles of the One whose life the writers are sketching. Consequently no attempt is made to present a deliberate and balanced judgement on the Pharisaic party as a whole. If, therefore, modern defenders of the Pharisees, like Elbogen and Chwolson, urge that the Pharisees condemned by Jesus were only a section of the whole, there is no reason why this should be denied by the New Testament student. It is a matter for investigation and is at least possibly true.

But it is less easy to admit the suggestion of Montefiore and other Jews, that Jesus was simply a prejudiced antagonist of the Pharisees, and that His criticism of their views and manner of life is biased, unreliable, and unfair. He deals less with ideal Pharisaism than with the actual Pharisees who attacked Him, and then mainly with specific and well-defined

[1] Cf. Mark xi. 27. [2] Mark xii. 12. [3] *Vide* chap. viii., (i.), 6.

exaggerations of their legal system, and, so far as one can judge to-day, His criticism is based on good and sound reason in religion. Indeed, many of His criticisms are regarded as just by modern Jews. Thus Montefiore, while charging Jesus with being more considerate towards 'sinners' than towards Pharisees, largely gives away his case when he says: 'It was the self-righteous formalist, the proud and sanctimonious observers of the ceremonial enactments of the Law, who either neglected, or but formally and negatively obeyed, its moral commandments, that found no mercy at His hands.'[1] A complete denial of the existence of these faults is therefore much less likely to carry conviction than the plea that they were not true of the whole class. And, as Menzies properly points out, Schechter confesses 'that the view he has to give of Rabbinical religion presents a blank at the important period—that of the Gospel. We are driven back, therefore, on the Gospels . . . the evidence afforded by the Synoptic Gospels appears irresistible. . . . An appeal to the principles of the religion as set forth in the Old Testament and in the Mishnah cannot prevail to discredit the facts there recorded.'[2]

In point of fact, the Gospels themselves make it quite clear that Jesus did not attack the whole class of Pharisees and their Scribes indiscriminately. 'Les reproches de Jésus ne portent évidemment pas sur tous les individus de la classe des scribes . . . Le Maître s'attaque aux vices les plus notoires de la corporation et met la foule en garde contre leur principal moyen d'influence, l'affectation de la piété.'[3] The Pharisee, Nicodemus, was evidently an honest seeker after truth, and was treated by Jesus as such[4]; Gamaliel was a man who was willing to follow the guidance of Providence even in regard to the new faith; and Saul of Tarsus, however mistaken, was no hypocrite. Further, the well-known words of Jesus: 'I came not to call the righteous, but sinners,'[5] uttered at different times and in different forms, need not be taken as ironical, even though those to whom they were spoken were lacking in pity for others. And such allusions to the 'righteous' of the time as are found,

[1] Montefiore, *Teaching of Jesus*, p. 54.

[2] Menzies, *Hibbert Journal*, July, 1903, vol. i., p. 792.

[3] 'The reproaches of Jesus evidently do not refer to all the individual members of the Scribal party. . . . The Master attacks the most notorious vices of the whole class and warns the crowd against their principal means of influence, the affectation of piety.' Lagrange, *Com. Marc*, p. 307.

[4] John iii. [5] Matt. x. 13.

for example, in Luke xv. 7, 29, clearly assume the existence of such, even if they also point to their imperfections. Even the story of the Pharisee praying in the Temple,[1] while revealing his vice, makes no attempt to deny his many virtues. To one Scribe Jesus said: 'Thou art not far from the Kingdom of God,'[2] and of those Scribes who received the new light He spoke in a way which showed how greatly He valued the good they already possessed.[3]

(*b*) *Were the Shammaites the Chief Culprits?*—If, then, there is good reason to believe that Jesus did not bring His charges of hypocrisy and formalism against the whole party of Pharisees, was there any section of them to whom such blame would be peculiarly applicable? Canon Box believes that this was the case. The Pharisees were divided into many sections. Seven are mentioned and described in the Talmud,[4] and of these five are criticized because of their failings, among which hypocrisy is prominent. In the time of Jesus the Hillelites and Shammaites were of outstanding importance, and formed two distinct and opposing schools of thought. The followers of Hillel were known for their gentleness and peaceableness, the Gamaliel of the Acts, a grandson of Hillel, being a worthy representative of this school. But in the middle of the first century and until after the destruction of Jerusalem they were less influential than their rivals.

During the lifetime of Jesus the Shammaites were the dominating school. Abrahams, one of the foremost modern Jewish scholars, says: 'It is by no means improbable that at the time of Jesus the views of Shammai were quite generally predominant, the school of Hillel only gaining supremacy in Jewish law and custom after the fall of the Temple,'[5] and Canon Box is of the same opinion.[6] Their characteristics are well known: harshness, fanaticism, formalism, and hypocrisy, and they did not fail to use their power in the propagation of their ideals, whether theoretical or practical. According to the Talmud[7] they succeeded just prior to the struggle with Rome in forcing the Sanhedrin to accept their eighteen articles, and of these the meticulous ritual regulating

[1] Luke xviii. 10 ff. [2] Mark xii. 34. [3] Matt. xiii. 52.
[4] Cf. *B. T. Sotah*, 22b, and *J. T. Berakhoth*, ix. 14b.
[5] *Studies in Phars. and Gos.*, p. 15.
[6] *E. R. E.*, art. 'Pharisees.' [7] *B. T. Shabbath*, 14b.

hand-washing was one. In the dispute with Jesus on this matter, it is significant that no objection was made to the practice of the disciples until the arrival of Scribes from Jerusalem,[1] and it is quite possible that they were representatives of the Shammaites. Dr. A. Büchler stoutly denies that ritual hand-washing was required of any but the priests, but admits that the Shammaites, in the middle of the first century may have demanded this kind of purification from teachers of the Law; though in the case of the Pharisees he believes that any who observed this requirement were rare exceptions.[2] We think it more probable, however, that at this period the Shammaites were struggling for the observance of their stricter view, and that even then their converts were more numerous than Büchler supposes. As Canon Box puts it: 'It is probable, then, that in the time of Jesus the question of ritual hand-washing was a party one, and that Jesus strongly opposed the Shammaite view. In fact, the impression is almost irresistible that the denunciations of the Pharisees occurring in the Gospels are directed primarily against a Shammaite section.[3]

This conclusion may be true, or at least the most probable, but it is far from being wholly satisfying. It is certainly strange that if the Pharisaic opponents of Jesus represented only the Shammaite section of that party, the other important section did not appear now and then to counteract their attacks. Save for one or two individual interventions, which would on this theory proceed from the Hillelites, that section might have been non-existent, so far as the Gospel evidence is concerned. Either the Hillelite section was curiously non-contentious or too weak at this time to venture on open opposition to their adversaries. Some students would, not without reason, draw a different inference, and conclude that however the two schools differed from each other they were not markedly different in their attitude to the new Teacher. However this may have been, the practical conclusion is clear enough, namely that the Pharisees whom Jesus criticized were the dominant religious force in His time.

(*c*) *Conclusion.* When all allowances have been made and all exceptions taken into account, there seems no reason to doubt the substantial truth of the criticism of Jesus of those

[1] Mark vii. 1.
[2] *Rev. Theol. and Philos.*, iv. 3, p. 141.
[3] *Der gal. Am-ha-Arets*, p. 138.

Pharisees whom He encountered. Even Jewish writers find it difficult to escape from this conclusion. Thus Montefiore: 'We may assume that it was the bad Pharisees and Rabbis . . . who were attacked by Jesus. The Talmud speaks of hypocritical Pharisees who loved to show off a pretended piety. . . . Josephus usually praises the Pharisees and dilates upon their good qualities. In one place, however (*Ant.*, XVII. ii), he speaks of them as a party (μόριον) γεραίρειν τὸ θεῖον προσποιούμενοι (making men believe that they are favoured by God). . . . There was doubtless some material for attack.'[1] And even if Schürer's conjecture is correct, viz. that the criticism of the Pharisees found in Josephus was copied by him from Nikolaus Damascenus, it possesses more rather than less value on that account.[2] I. Abrahams remonstrates with M. Friedländer for using Pharisaic self-criticism[3] as a ground for believing the party guilty of the abuses named, but his own conclusion goes no further than that 'it is manifestly unjust to treat the criticism as though it could apply against Pharisaism as a whole.'[4]

Their insistence on the vital importance of the separation of the holy people from all unholy things and people had led to a seriously misplaced emphasis. The outer form had usurped the place of the inner reality, the 'means' had overshadowed the 'end.' Technical and external obedience had been substituted for the spirit of obedience, and in place of the kernel of whole-hearted love, commanded of old,[5] there was often little but the husk. Tithes had become a mania,[6] indeed Pharisees offered everything but themselves—the one gift desired by God.

Then, in seeking relief from the intolerable burdens of their law's multitudinous demands, subterfuge and shallowness inevitably supervened. The case of 'gifts' has been named already. As another instance, Sabbath-evasion may be referred to. 'A whole treatise of the Mishnah is devoted to contrivances for easing the pressure of the Sabbatic yoke, especially in reference to the length of a Sabbath-day journey, and the distance to which things, such as articles of food, might be carried. This was achieved by the method of connexions, in Rabbinical dialect Erubin. Several houses standing in

[1] *Syn. Gos.*, i. 295.
[2] *Die relig. Beweg.*, p. 112.
[3] Op. cit., II. ii. 4, *n.*
[4] *Studies in Pharisees and Jesus*, p. 80.
[5] Deut. vi. 4–7.
[6] Matt. xxiii. 23.

one court, e.g. might be formed into one house by the separate householders agreeing to deposit an article of food at a certain spot in the court. One desirous of making a journey longer than two thousand paces might lawfully do so by depositing food for two meals near the legal limit, whereby the spot where the food was deposited became his domicile, so that after having travelled already the legal distance, he might set out from that point and travel as far again, and so on, *ad libitum*.'[1] Such practices may have been ingenious, but are fatal to genuine religion.

So far as the predominant Pharisaism of that time is concerned, it had failed in no uncertain fashion. The inheritance of a great past had hardened and withered in its hands, and without a revitalizing transformation it could have had no future. Happily a change did come, partly through catastrophe, as had been the case in earlier generations. How much also was indirectly contributed by the spiritual impetus of the Christianity which Pharisaism opposed at first is a disputed point, but it was probably considerable. Certain it is that had the influences which prevailed in the time of Jesus, whether emanating from the school of Shammai only or from the party as a whole, retained their ascendance Pharisaism would not have survived the Fall of the sacred city.

III. In the Early Church

Not much need be said in this chapter on this subject. It is so closely connected with the conduct of their opponents, that it will be better to defer it till we deal with the Sadducees.

Briefly, the Pharisees seem at first to have permitted the infant Church to go on its way unmolested. And the opportunist advice of Rabbi Gamaliel[2] to wait and watch fairly represents this temporary spirit of neutrality. But a decided change occurred after Stephen's arrest and trial. The Law was again in jeopardy. His accusers had 'heard him speak blasphemous words against Moses and God,'[3] and this touched to the quick their legalistic temper. In the persecution which followed no doubt Saul's 'zeal' represented a large section of the Pharisaic party.[4] Yet there were others 'who believed' though deeply attached to the Law.[5] The Pharisees'

[1] Bruce, *Kingdom of God*, p. 197 f.
[2] Acts v. 34 ff.
[3] Acts vi. 11.
[4] Acts viii. 1–3.
[5] Acts xv. 5.

intervention at Saul's trial gives us little guidance. It may be held to reveal a more reasonable tolerance towards Christians, but, on the other hand, it may be merely another outbreak against their old adversaries, the Sadducees.[1]

[1] Acts xxiii. 9.

Chapter VIII

RELATIONS WITH JESUS AND THE EARLY CHURCH

B. The Sadducees

In striking contrast with their opponents the Sadducees are mentioned very rarely in the Gospels, at any rate by name. By Mark and Luke they are named only once each.[1] In the Fourth Gospel they are omitted altogether. In Matthew they are coupled with the Pharisees six times. Hölscher's[2] explanation of the scantiness of these allusions is simple and thorough-going: the Sadducees, being only lax scoffers, consisting of traders, professional men, and well-to-do people generally, without any religious convictions to trouble about, were naturally quite indifferent to the religious movements of the time. Jesus and His disciples might be known to them by name, but that would be all.

Hölscher's general theory on the subject has already been alluded to.[3] Of New Testament documents only Mark and Luke's writings are to be regarded as of real value for this investigation, and to these he adds Josephus and the Talmud. As the result of his critical investigation, he finds a double tradition running throughout the whole of this literature: the *War* (of Josephus), Mark, and the Mishnah representing the older and more reliable account, the *Antiquities* (of Josephus), the Acts, and the later Talmud literature giving a later and unhistorical record. The later story blackens the character of the Sadducees, evidently in the interest of the Pharisees; whereas the former shows that the real opponents of Jesus were the Pharisees and not, as is represented in the Acts, the Sadducees.

This theory is of course based on the assumption that there is no connexion between the Sadducees and the high-priestly

[1] Mark xii. 18–27; Luke xx. 27 f. [2] *Der Sadduzäismus.* [3] Chap. v. above.

party, and this we hold to be a fundamental error. Moreover, it is surely more than strange that men who were merely scoffers and entirely indifferent to religious matters should approach Jesus with a question concerning the resurrection. And this interposition, be it observed, is recorded by Mark, who on H lscher's theory is trustworthy.

It would seem that Hölscher has provided his readers with an explanation quite needlessly large for the facts of the case ; something simpler may serve the purpose and prove nearer the truth. One is, of course, impressed by the slight reference to the Sadducees by the Synoptists, but the reason seems fairly obvious. They were, in simple truth, outside the story, until it drew near its end. According to all our information they were but little interested in the common people, among whom the life of Jesus was spent. Nor were they interested in religious developments. What they desired and sought was an untroubled life, so that they might enjoy the good things which a kindly fortune had thrown in their path. It was a selfish or self-centred mode of life, but accorded quite well with their entirely 'moderate' outlook in matters of religion. Little wonder, then, that they came into contact with Jesus so little, and that when they did it was to stifle a possible revolution.

Nor can we accept Hölscher's view that the record in Acts, where, as in Josephus, the Sadducees are seen to be intimately associated with the high-priestly party, is to be discredited. Whether the high-priestly party was wholly Sadducean or not, we do not go far wrong in assuming Sadducean influence when we see a deputation from the high-priests in the neighbourhood of Jesus.[1]

It need not be denied that the relative positions of the two parties towards Christians do change somewhat when we turn from the Gospels to the Acts of the Apostles, but the change is neither as considerable as Hölscher suggests nor is it incapable of explanation. The Pharisees are in the Gospels the relentless antagonists of Jesus, whereas in the Acts they stand at first in the background. On the other hand, the Sadducees of the Gospel-record appear to ignore the new movement altogether until near the end, while in the Acts they are in the van of the opposition. Hölscher's explanation is, as has been

[1] The later edition of Schürer declines to follow Hölscher.

stated, that the account in Acts is unhistorical, the work of a later age whose aim was to shed a more favourable light on the relations of the Pharisees with Jesus, since so many of them had become Christians. But this theory of falsification seems superfluous. The Pharisees from the first had been mainly interested in the Law, and they defended it from the outset against the attacks of Jesus and His followers. In the Acts they remain quiescent only for a time, for as soon as Stephen and those who thought with him had revealed the new danger they rise again in defence of the Law. It was Saul, one of themselves, who led the persecution. As to the Sadducees, there is no real difference between their conduct towards Jesus on the one hand and the early Church on the other. In each case their dominant consideration was to keep the peace and so secure their own safety. Until near the end the movement led by Jesus seemed harmless, however mistaken, and the Sadducees kept aloof; but once it menaced the peace of the community they quickly bestirred themselves, and, as we know, to some purpose. Again, in Acts, we see them moving slowly at first, guided perhaps by the idea that the remnants of the agitation would disappear before long, and all the more quickly for being let alone. But when they found dangerous crowds gathering and ominous references to their own responsibility for the death of Jesus, their cumulative and destructive activity in opposition did not tarry.

I. The Sadducees' Relations with Jesus

Our investigation divides itself into two parts, and we begin with the account in the Gospels of the Sadducees' attitude to Jesus.

1. *At the Baptism of John.*[1] It is instructive to see first of all how the Sadducees acted when the forerunner of the Galilean Prophet appeared. We therefore begin with their alleged appearance at the Baptism of John.

According to Mark,[2] those who came to the Baptist were 'all the country of Judea and all they of Jerusalem,' without specifying whether any of the leading authorities were amongst the number. Luke likewise omits any reference to the authorities, mentioning only the multitudes, the publicans, and the soldiers. Matthew, however, who is writing for a

[1] Matt. iii. 7; cf. xxi. 25, 32, and Luke vii. 30.

[2] Mark i. 5.

different type of reader, and one much more interested in Jewish life, definitely tells us[1] that the Baptist 'saw many of the Pharisees and Sadducees coming to his Baptism.' His words were therefore not only addressed to 'the rabble—the lower orders—the illiterate, noisy, mischief-makers,'[2] but to the leaders of the people. Matthew's account, though not supported by the other Synoptists, seems most probable in the nature of things, for not even the Pharisees, still less the multitudes, prided themselves more than the Sadducees did on their pure descent from Abraham. '. . . Drawn doubtless by mixed motives, as persons of their type generally are, moral simplicity not being in their line; partly curious, partly fascinated, partly come to spy; in an ambiguous state of mind, neither decidedly in sympathy nor pronouncedly hostile. In any case they cannot remain indifferent to a movement so deep and widespread. So here they are; coming *to* (ἐπὶ) John's baptism, not to be baptized, nor coming *against*, as some (Olearius, e.g.) have thought, as if to put the movement down, but coming to witness the strange, novel phenomenon, and form their impressions. . . .'[3]

It is assumed by some writers that Matthew intended to signify that the Pharisees and Sadducees accepted John's baptism because he reports their coming to the Jordan-baptism, but his narrative tells us nothing of the sort. And, indeed, after the rebuke which, according to this Evangelist, he administered to them, one would hardly expect it. Moreover, later on, he himself plainly indicates the contrary, and with this Luke is in agreement.[4] That the priestly authorities should feel it their duty to inquire into the meaning of the new movement was natural enough, and equally so that they should leave it severely alone when they found how the Baptist treated them, the 'official representatives of religion.' After John's description of them as 'vipers fleeing from the wrath to come' they were not likely to remain and hear much more.

2. *Jesus Warns against their Leaven.*[5]—According to Matthew the warning given is against both Pharisees and Sadducees. Mark's testimony is somewhat different, as he substitutes the

[1] Matt. iii 7.
[2] Bruce, *E.G.T.*, vol. i., p. 82.
[3] A. Wright, *Syn. Gos.*, p. 188 (2nd ed.).
[4] Cf. Matt. xxi. 25, 32; Luke vii. 30.
[5] Matt. xvi. 5–12; cf. Mark viii. 14–21.

Herodians for the Sadducees. In another connexion Luke[1] refers to the leaven of the Pharisees only.

The question is, therefore, whether Matthew and Mark are referring to different sections of the community, or whether, on the other hand, Matthew supposes the Sadducees to include the Herodians, or, perhaps, Mark intends the Herodians to include the Sadducees. On this point there will be differences of opinion, and we shall content ourselves with quoting Swete:

'. . . But the worldliness of the Herod family and of Antipas's court was not far removed from the temper of the Sadducean aristocrats; and the supporters of the Herod dynasty were probably disposed to Sadducean rather than Pharisaic views. Matthew seems to have used Σαδδουκαῖοι in this passage as roughly equivalent to Ἡρωδιανοί (Macc. iii. 6; Matt. xxii. 16). "The leaven of Herod" was doubtless the practical unbelief which springs from love of the world and the immoralities to which in a coarser age it led. Bede: "Fermentum Herodis est adulterium, homocidium, temeritas jurandi, simulatio religionis." There are occasions when this tendency can ally itself with punctilious externalism in religious practice; the two are perhaps never fundamentally at variance. Both were to be carefully shunned by the Twelve and the future Church.'[2]

3. *Cleansing of the Temple.*[3]—We now reach the Marcan source in our investigation. According to Mark's narrative, Christ's condemnation of the abuse of the House of Prayer was heard by the chief priests and Scribes, and, without assigning any motives for their feelings, he tells us that they 'sought how they might destroy Him,' but were hindered by their fear of the multitude, who were 'astonished at His teaching.'

Matthew fills in the omission. The chief priests and Scribes, when they saw the wonderful things Jesus did, and heard the children crying 'Hosanna to the Son of David,' were moved with indignation, and called His attention to the words the children were using. Luke points out that the Pharisees had already called upon Jesus to rebuke His disciples for their exalted language on His entry into Jerusalem, and at a later stage reports that the chief priests, Scribes, and principal men

[1] Luke xii. 1 ff.
[2] *Com. Mark*, p. 170.
[3] Mark xi. 15–18; Matt. xxi. 12–16; Luke xix. 45–47.

of the people sought to destroy Him, but the attitude of the people forbade.

For a description of the necessary traffic in the Temple court and the abuses which had grown up in connexion with it the reader may refer to Edersheim's *Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah.*'[1] The anger of the Temple authorities is not to be wondered at. 'The chief priests and Scribes . . . were the constituted authorities who had licensed this desecration of the Temple. They sold these rights to the traders, and they resented this invasion of their constituted rights.'[2] In addition, Christ's action was an exercise of Messianic authority, little if at all concealed. The crowd of whom the high-priestly party stood in such awe consisted mainly of Galileans and Gentiles—hence the desire to avoid a disturbance among people who were unaccustomed to their influence.

4. *The Question re Authority.*[3]—It was, apparently, on the day immediately following the foregoing that the chief priests, Scribes, and Elders met Jesus with this question, which He countered so effectively with His own query respecting the Baptism of John. If fear of the people had prevented the authorities from taking the more drastic measures they desired, they were determined to leave no stone unturned which might discredit the upstart-Teacher in the eyes of the crowd whose enthusiasm thwarted them. This might check possible mischief arising from His teaching and prepare the way for His complete destruction. Hence their question, upon which they had evidently deliberated with great care since their discomfiture on the previous day. In reality the question was twofold: by what kind of authority was His acting, and from what source had He derived it? The answer of Jesus is not to be understood as a mere debating retort, nor was it really simple. Underlying its superficial simplicity it asks whether His opponents recognize the same standards as He did for testing divine authority. And their reply, such as it was, reveals an undoubted lapse into hypocrisy—the sin usually associated with the Pharisees and their Scribes. Perhaps the most striking feature in the whole incident is the refusal of Jesus to pursue the subject further, once they had declined to answer the question He put to them, the implication of which is that

[1] Bk. iii, chap. v.
[2] Gould, *Com. Mark, I. C. C.*, p. 214.
[3] Mark xi. 27–33; Matt. xxi. 23–27; Luke xx. 1–8.

He denies their right to the authority which they claimed as the representatives of the Jewish religion.[1]

5. *The Vineyard Parable.*[2]—In Mark and Luke this follows the preceding discussion immediately. Matthew interposes the parable of the Two Sons, and the present parable then follows without any breach of continuity. Although Mark does not state in so many words who were the hearers, the evident suggestion is that they were the same as those of the preceding section, and the other two Synoptists say plainly that they consisted of the same authorities, the chief priests being of the number. It was not the parable only that angered the listeners, but the quotation from Psalm cxviii. 22 f. Again, we are told, they sought to lay hold on the speaker and were again hindered by their fear of the multitude.[3]

6. *Question re Tribute.*[4]—Luke says the questioners were the Scribes and chief priests; Mark and Matthew, the Pharisees and Herodians (cf. § 2 above, where Mark has Pharisees and Herodians, and Matthew Pharisees and Sadducees). Mark introduces his statement with the remark that 'they send unto Him certain of the Pharisees and of the Herodians,' and by inference he would seem to mean that the 'senders' were the chief priests, Scribes and Elders mentioned in xi. 27. Allen takes this view,[5] and Bruce is of the same opinion: 'In this astute scheme the Synedrists, according to Mark, were the prime movers, using other parties as their agents.'[6] Micklem regards the Herodians as the extreme political wing of the Sadducean party.[7] Whether this were so or not, it is evident that we do the Sadducees no injustice in associating them with the Herodians. The strongest argument against this conclusion is to be found in the general disposition of the Sadducees to allow political matters to remain tranquil, lest any change should cause them to lose their highly favoured position in the life of the nation. And there is much force in

[1] *Vide* Gould, *Com. Mark*, p. 219.

[2] Mark xii. 1–12; Matt. xxi. 33–46; Luke xx. 9–19.

[3] *Vide* Swete, *Com. Mark*, lxxxv, where he shows the effect of this series of events on the authorities.

[4] Luke xx. 19 ff; cf. Mark xii. 13–17, Matt. xxii. 15–22. See also above, chapter vii. (1).

[5] Allen, *Com. Matt. I. C. C.*, p. 237.

[6] Bruce, op. cit., p. 273. Matthew mentions the Pharisees only, but they would have little influence with the Herodians.

[7] Micklem, *Com. Matt.*, p. xliv.

this point. But the Sadducees were in the mood to use desperate remedies to secure their ends, and they regarded these provincial crowds as dangerous to the peace and so necessitating action on their part to which they were ordinarily indisposed.

This purpose is made perfectly clear in Luke, who says: 'They watched Him and sent forth spies, which feigned to be righteous,[1] that they might take hold of His speech, so as to deliver Him up to the rule and to the authority of the Governor.' Mark and Matthew are similar. It was really a deeply laid plot against the life of Jesus, and the issue, as they believed, admitted of only two alternatives: either He would declare Himself an ardent nationalist, and so lay Himself open to a charge of treason; or, He would indicate His approval of the existing Government and so dissipate His influence with the people. Apparently they cared little which of the two courses He took if only He gave them the opportunity of getting rid of His presence.

7. *Question re the Resurrection.*[2]—This question in all the Synoptics follows the discussion concerning the 'Tribute.' The questioners are in this instance the Sadducees alone, and all the Synoptists introduce the subject with the remark that the Sadducees say that there is no resurrection.

The question was based on an ancient custom which was not confined to Israel, but practised by Arabians and others, and is still widely prevalent in certain tribes in Asia, America, and Polynesia.[3] It required that a man's childless widow should be married by his surviving brother, so that the name of the deceased might be preserved in any resulting issue.[4] In the present supposed case seven brothers marry the widow in turn, but in each instance without issue. Then, ask the Sadducees, whose wife shall she be in the resurrection?

What was the purpose of the questioners? One writer is of opinion that they were 'aiming at amusement rather than deadly mischief.'[5] But we know from what precedes and follows that they were in deadly earnest. Swete's comment is

[1] *δικαίους*—Heb. צדיקים which T. H. Weir regards as an error for צדוקים i.e. Sadducees (*Expos. T.*, xxviii. 426), quite a possible suggestion.

[2] Mark xii. 18–27; Matt. xxii. 23–33; Luke xx. 27–40.

[3] Cf. Bruce, *E. G. T.* i., 275; Driver, *Com. Deut.*, *I. C. C.*, 281, *.

[4] Cf. Deut. xxv. 5–10; Gen. xxxviii. 8.

[5] Bruce, op. cit., ad loc.

more penetrating: 'The question was perhaps partly tentative; they were curious to know the exact position which this Teacher, who was known to be adverse to the Pharisees, would take with regard to the main point at issue between the Pharisees and themselves. But their purpose was hostile; the extreme case they offer for His opinion is clearly intended as a *reductio ad absurdum* of any view but their own.'[1] Lagrange remarks: 'On aboutit a une impasse grotesque qui prouve que la resurrection ne saurait avoir lieu.'[2] No doubt this is so, but why should the Sadducees introduce this contentious point of difference at the very time when they were in such close alliance with the Pharisees against Jesus? One can only surmise that the Pharisees, having now gone away (as appears to be the case from Mark xii. 28), the Sadducees seized the opportunity to submit to Jesus a question which they had often used to puzzle the Pharisaic Rabbis. What better opportunity could they have of making this uneducated pretender from the country look small in the eyes of His admirers? If successful, and it could hardly be otherwise, it would certainly aid their polemic against Him.

Perhaps nowhere does the kindly temper of the young Prophet show to greater advantage than here. He first tells them that they 'err' (πλανᾶσθε), and at the conclusion of His argument He repeats the remark in gentle tones: 'Ye do greatly err' (πολὺ πλανᾶσθε). In the argument He shows them how: first, in regard to the nature of the resurrection; for in the changed state there would be no such thing as marriage.[3] Then, too, in regard to the fact itself, they were really ignorant of their own Scriptures,[4] or they would have known that the God of the patriarchs 'cannot be in relation with any who have ceased to exist,'[5] and therefore that the soul continues its existence beyond this life. It is significant that in this treatment of the Sadducees Jesus is much less severe than when dealing with the hypocrisy of the Pharisees.

8. *Bringing Jesus to Death.*—As is well known, the Sadducees are not mentioned by name in this connexion, but the 'chief priests,' who were the core of the Sadducean party, play a

[1] Swete, *Com. Mark*, p. 278.

[2] 'The result is a grotesque impasse which proves that the resurrection could not take place' (Lagrange, *Com. Marc*, p. 296).

[3] Cf. Enoch xv. 4 ff.

[4] Exod. iii. 2, 6 is quoted.

[5] Swete, *Com. Mark*, ad loc.

very prominent part in all the events by which it is brought about. As Plummer says, in summarizing the argument of Chwolson,[1] 'it was the Sadducees, the servile upholders of Roman authority, who took the lead against Christ. They were the wealthy class, who lived on the Temple sacrifices and dues, and therefore were bitter antagonists of a Teacher whose doctrine tended to the reform of lucrative abuses.'[2]

Even when we restrict ourselves to the Marcan source the Sadducees' complicity stands out clearly enough; they were in fact the prime movers in all the events which led to the death of Jesus.

(*a*) Having apparently brooded over their humiliation, brought about by the recent words and actions of Jesus, they now conspire to put Him to death.[3] The conspirators are described by Mark and Luke as the chief priests and Scribes, by Matthew as the chief priests and Elders; in both accounts the chief priests take the leading position. According to Matthew, the Council met in the court of Caiaphas, who was Chief Priest at the time. Their decision was quite in conformity with their earlier avowed intentions.[4] But, as before, discretion deferred the execution of their purposes; previously it was from fear of the multitude, on the present occasion in order to avoid a tumult among the people. It was the time of the Passover, and great unmanageable crowds filled the city, among whom were large numbers from the northern province of Galilee, where Jesus was so popular.

(*b*) Next in order, we come to the betrayal by Judas Iscariot.[5] It is not without significance that when Judas determined to betray his Master he seems to have had no doubt where his offer would be received most eagerly. He was at once given an audience by the chief priests,[6] who heard with gladness his suggestion and promised him suitable recompense, evidently for his services to them. Their pleasure was probably due to two causes: Judas would now save them the trouble of devising a safe method of arresting Jesus, and would execute it as secretly as possible, for his own sake. Probably, too, they saw in his action the beginning of a break-up in the band of the disciples. Thus, though the authorities now

[1] *Das letzte Passamahl Christi*, App.
[2] Plum., *Com. Luke*, *I. C. C.*, 519, n.
[3] Mark xiv. 1 f.; Matt. xxvi. 1 f; Luke xxii. 1 f.
[4] Cf. Mark xi. 18, xii. 12.
[5] Mark xiv. 10 f; Matt. xxvi. 14 ff; Luke xxii. 3 ff.
[6] Mark, Matt., Luke; Luke adds 'captains.'

become outwardly quiescent, it was only because this was the best way of attaining their object. 'Notice that the chief priests become the leading actors in the proceedings against Jesus after His entry into Jerusalem, instead of the Scribes.'[1]

(*c*) The arrest of Jesus.[2] According to Mark, Judas and the multitude came from the chief priests, and the Scribes and the Elders. Matthew omits mention of the Scribes, so does Luke, but he adds: 'captains of the Temple.' It was a servant of the high-priest whose ear was cut off. Evidently, then, Judas had not picked up a crowd casually *en route*, but was acting with the assistance of his new masters, the chief priests.

(*d*) Examination of Jesus before Caiaphas, the high-priest.[3] The presence of the whole Council, consisting of chief priests, Scribes, and Elders is certified by all the Synoptists. 'Mark pictures the assembly as flocking together to the palace, Matthew represents them as already in session when Jesus arrived; all were probably on or near the spot, awaiting the result of Judas's mission.'[4] Whether the principal part of the examination took place the same evening or the following morning, a matter greatly in dispute, does not affect the part taken in it by the chief priests. At the outset 'the chief priests and the whole Council' sought evidence against Jesus, and one is surprised to find their preparations so curiously inadequate. The utmost of the accused's crime was a disputed statement that He would destroy the Temple and rebuild it. Recognizing that this charge was useless, the high-priest himself intervened, remonstrating with Jesus for not answering the witnesses, and probably hoping now as before that the accused would entangle Himself in His speech. When this led to nothing, the high-priest asked Him pointedly whether He claimed to be 'the Christ, the Son of the Blessed,' and when Jesus with equal plainness said, 'I am,' His questioner rent his clothes and declared the claim to be blasphemous. 'It was the claim to the second title "Son of God" on which the issue of a capital charge turned (cf. John x. 36) and with which later Jesus was taunted (xxvii. 43). This Luke shows more clearly by making each title the subject of a distinct question

[1] Gould, *Com. Mark*, p. 260.
[2] Mark xiv. 43 ff; Matt. xxvi. 47 ff; Luke xxii. 47 ff.
[3] Mark xiv. 53 ff; Matt. xxvi. 57 ff; Luke xxii. 54, 66 ff.
[4] Swete, *Com. Mark*, p. 355.

(xxii. 67, 70), the answer to the second of which proved decisive.'[1] Then it was that 'they' spat upon and buffeted the prisoner—whether an act of the members of the Sanhedrin or His captors is uncertain. '. . . In this examination,' says Gould, 'they proceed as a prosecuting body, seeking testimony by which they may put Him to death, instead of sitting as judges on the question of His guilt.'[2]

(*e*) Before Pilate.[3] Having decided on their course of action, the whole Council next take Jesus before Pilate. The chief priests are specifically named by Mark and Matthew. 'It was Pilate's task not to try Jesus, but to confirm the result of a trial already held. But for this he must satisfy himself as to the justice of the verdict.'[4] Among the accusers the leading place is taken by the chief priests; indeed they alone are mentioned by Mark. Judging from the nature of Pilate's question to Jesus and the report of Luke, the charges seem to have been three: seditious agitation, forbidding payment of tribute, claiming kingship—all of a political nature.[5] The last was apparently the construction put on Jesus' claim to Divine Messiahship, either by the Sanhedrin in their report to Pilate, or by Pilate himself. 'They had translated "Christ" into "King of the Jews" for Pilate's benefit, so astutely giving a political aspect to what under the other name was only a question of religion or, as a Roman would view it, superstition.'[6] The Governor's offer to release Jesus was resisted by the multitude at the instigation of the authorities, the chief priests again taking the lead.[7]

(*f*) Mocking Jesus on the cross.[8] Both chief priests and Scribes are mentioned by Mark and Matthew in this unforgiveable act, Matthew adding 'the Elders'; Luke generalizes, using the single term 'rulers.'

There are two other references by Matthew to the activity of the chief priests after the death of Jesus,[9] but they are unsupported by the other Evangelists and may be left out of consideration.

[1] Micklem, *Com. Matt.*, p. 260.
[2] Gould, *Com. Mark*, p. 276.
[3] Mark xv. 1 ff; Matt. xxvii. 1, 11 ff; Luke xxiii. 1 ff, 13 ff.
[4] Micklem, *Com. Matt.*, p. 265.
[5] *Vide* Plummer, *Com. Luke*, 520.
[6] Bruce, *E. G. T.*, vol. i. 324.
[7] Cf. Mark and Matthew.
[8] Mark xv. 31 f; Matt. xxvii. 41 ff; Luke xxiii. 35.
[9] Matt. xxvii. 62 ff, xxviii. 11 ff.

II. The Attitude of the Sadducees to the Early Christian Community

At the outset the Christians were not disturbed. They had their own meeting-place, where 'all with one accord continued steadfastly in prayer,' elected a successor to Judas, waited for and received the Pentecostal blessing, added to their numbers and had all things in common. They observed the Law and frequented the Temple, and thus in all public matters were unexceptionable. 'By their strict observance of the Law and their devoted attachment to the Temple, they fulfilled a Jew's *principal* duty, and since it was in the future that they expected Jesus as their Messiah—His first Advent having been no more than a preliminary step—this feature might be overlooked, as an idiosyncrasy, by those who were inclined to think well of them for their strict observance of the law.'[1] Thus a brief and valuable period of peace was granted to the Community. Otherwise 'it could not have attained the proportions or strength presupposed by the persecution witnessed to by Paul. . . . The early Church was faithful to the Law; on that side it gave no offence; indeed its adherents could very well be distinguished by genuine Jewish piety.'[2] This, however, was while the Christians remained indoors and were preparing themselves for their great crusade and propaganda. Once they came into the open and uttered the truth that was in them, all was changed, at least in one quarter. We have now to examine the effect of this change among the Sadducees.

1. *Arrest of Peter and John.*[3]—This first arrest was effected by 'the priests and the captain of the Temple and the Sadducees.' The first-named were probably acting as guard at the Temple; the captain was their chief, himself a priest, and second in authority only to the high-priest himself. The incident occurred while Peter was addressing the crowd which had gathered in astonishment after the healing of the lame man. On the morrow the whole Sanhedrin assembled to deal with the case, consisting as usual of Rulers, Elders, and Scribes; especially named are Annas, Caiaphas, John, Alexander, 'and as many as were of the kindred of the high-priest.' Pharisees would of course attend, but were not prominent.

[1] Harnack, *Expansion of Christianity*, i. 51.
[2] Weizsäcker, *Apos. Age*, i. 24.
[3] Acts iv. 1 ff.

The anxiety of the authorities was based on several grounds: (*a*) The apostles had been teaching the people, and their language could quite easily be regarded as inflammatory[1]; (*b*) they also 'proclaimed in Jesus the resurrection from the dead,' and thus set themselves in opposition to a fundamental tenet of the most powerful section of their judges; (*c*) and in the course of the trial the authorities noted that these men had been adherents of that pretended Messiah who had already given them so much trouble, whom they in fact had crucified and whose death was now being laid at their door. In all these matters it was the ruling priestly order that was chiefly concerned. The Pharisees were largely indifferent to the public aspect of the death of Jesus, and would be much more pleased than annoyed that His followers were teaching the resurrection—one of their own doctrines, and so undesignedly aiding them against their age-long opponents. Hence their silence. But Weizsäcker is hardly doing justice to the whole case when he states that the persecution is due entirely to the preaching of the resurrection.[2] The rulers were quite as much, or even more, concerned about their own security, and for this reason abhorred disturbances and crowds. This danger evidently greatly alarmed them, and their question: 'By what power, or in what name, have ye done this?' is a sign of bewilderment which would be intensified when they discovered the relationship between their prisoners and the crucified Jesus.

That they would wish to take immediate steps to close the mouths of these disturbers of the peace we may reasonably suppose, but their fear of exciting the people and so bringing about the very trouble they most wished to avoid, stood in the way. So, with blustering threats and strict injunctions to desist from their preaching, they let them go.

2. *Second Arrest and Trial before the Sanhedrin.*[3]—This event followed several remarkable incidents indicative of the growing popularity of the apostles. Ananias and Sapphira had been stricken dead; signs and wonders had been wrought among the people; the multitude held the apostles in awe, and brought their sick into the streets so that even Peter's shadow might fall upon them; and the crowds came in from the district round

[1] Acts iii. 15, 17. [2] Weizsäcker, op. cit., i. 22. [3] Acts v. 17–42.

about Jerusalem. No one could now ignore the new movement, least of all those who were interested in the quiet government of the province.

Those who effected the arrest are plainly named, viz. the high-priest and his usual associates, the sect of the Sadducees. The trial took place before the Council and all the Senate. The leading motive was apparently the same as before, though the question of the resurrection does not emerge. The 'jealousy' mentioned in verse 17 is probably best explained by verse 28: 'We straitly charged you not to teach in this Name; and behold ye have filled Jerusalem with your teaching, and intend to bring this man's blood upon us.' The driving motive was fear—fear of losing their place, possibly even their lives. Little wonder that they were 'sawn to the heart' and were minded to slay them.

That this extreme course was not adopted was due to the interposition of 'a Pharisee named Gamaliel, a Doctor of the Law,' who counselled them to leave the issue in the hands of Providence, together with the unpleasant discovery that the Council was divided on the case, and therefore if violent measures were attempted they could not hope to carry the Pharisees with them. Whatever the reason, the Pharisees were not at this stage disposed to interfere with the new sect, and in the end the apostles were only beaten and again forbidden to speak in the name of Jesus—a result widely different from the intention of the high-priests.

3. *Stephen's Death and the Great Persecution.*[1]—This incident marks the end of the comparative truce which the early Christians enjoyed. The first actors in the drama were certain Hellenists—Libertines, Cyrenians, Alexandrians, and Cilicians—in whose Synagogue Stephen disputed with them. Being worsted in argument they stirred up the people, the Elders and the Scribes, by charging Stephen with using blasphemous words against Moses and God. According to them he had stated that Jesus of Nazareth would destroy the Temple and change the Mosaic Laws. The random charge served its purpose. The council was summoned and the high-priest filled his usual rôle of questioner. Feeling ran high, and the wonder is that Stephen was allowed to deliver so much of his

[1] Acts vi. 12–viii. 3.

speech. Its effect, however, was only to increase the bitterness of the crowd against him. They gnashed on him with their teeth and finally stoned him.

This change from the earlier and milder attitude is not difficult to follow. From the beginning the Sadducees were in little doubt as to the seriousness of the movement and the need for strong measures. But they were unsupported by their Pharisaic colleagues in the Sanhedrin and the general body of the people. Hence they were obliged to restrain themselves and bide their time. But Stephen's alleged attack on the Law and the Temple incited both Pharisees and people to opposition. This accomplished, the rest was easy.

'And there arose on that day a great persecution against the Church which was in Jerusalem; and they were scattered abroad throughout the regions of Judea and Samaria, except the apostles.'[1] No doubt the Sadducees, now the chief enemies of the apostles, would take a prominent part, but, judging from the place occupied by Saul in the persecution, one discerns with what vigour the Pharisees had also thrown themselves into the movement. It was the Pharisee Saul who wanted letters to Damascus to aid him in his mission of vengeance, and he apparently found no difficulty in obtaining them from the high-priest. Thus the tables were turned: it was the Pharisees who had so persistently dogged the steps of Jesus with such unceasing opposition that the Sadducees had been obliged to take the matter in hand and bring about His death. And now the Sadducees, in their turn, found themselves able to involve the Pharisees in the persecution of the Nazarene's followers.

4. *Trial of Paul before the Sanhedrin, and its Sequel.*[2]—More than twenty years had passed since the death of Stephen and the commencement of the ensuing persecution. All but the apostles had been scattered abroad, and this may explain the comparative quietness which followed. The short reign of Herod Agrippa I brought new trouble, James the brother of John being slain and Peter imprisoned for a time. But beyond the statement that this 'pleased the Jews,' we are not told whether any particular section of the Jews were the accomplices of this time-serving monarch. The little band of Christians 'had been persecuted by the Sadducean high-priests: then

[1] Acts viii. 1. [2] Acts xxii. 30–xxiii. 10, xxiv. 1 ff, xxv. 8.

by the Pharisees and the people. There remained one more party among the Jews—the Herodians. And now Herod himself thrust out his hands and struck a blow at the Church.'[1]

Ten or more years had gone by since this wantonness on the part of Agrippa. The majority of the Christians had probably kept clear of the capital, and with one or two exceptions the Apostles likewise.[2] Those remaining were perhaps zealous in their observance of the Law and so escaped molestation. But the return from his third missionary journey of Paul, the former Pharisee, showed that the old jealousy for the Law was neither dead nor asleep. After the uproar in the Temple Paul was brought before the full Sanhedrin for judgement. The high-priest, Ananias, son of Nedebaios,[3] is expressly named, also the chief priests, the Pharisees, and the Sadducees. The astuteness of Paul in declaring himself to be a Pharisee in so far as the doctrine of the resurrection was concerned produced a complete division among his judges, the Pharisees declaring: 'We find no evil in this man,' and their opponents being nonplussed. With such diversity of opinion in the Sanhedrin the high-priest could not rely upon the people to support any stern course of action, and Paul was sent back again to prison. Without this remarkably clever interposition of the apostle condemnation would most probably have ensued; the tumult had broken out in the Temple because of his alleged breach of the Law, and on such an issue the Pharisees held even stronger views than the Sadducees themselves.

The chagrin of the defeated ruling body is shown in the sequel. A conspiracy of forty zealots to slay Paul was manifestly viewed sympathetically by the chief priests and Elders,[4] and had Lysias been less alert Paul's attack on the Law would have come to a speedy and gruesome end. It is also significant that when the apostle had to appear before Felix his accusers were the high-priest and certain Elders, who took with them a professional advocate to argue their case. Still later, when the new Procurator, Festus, arrived, their hostility had in no way abated; 'The chief priests and the principal men of the Jews informed him against Paul; and they besought him, asking favour against him, that he would send for him to Jerusalem; laying wait to kill him on the way.'[5] Ishmael

[1] Rackham, *Com. Acts*, 173.
[2] Cf. Acts viii. 1, 14.
[3] *Circa* A.D. 47–59.
[4] Acts xxiii. 14 f.
[5] Acts xxv. 2 f.

ben Phabi had succeeded Ananias in the high-priesthood, but the bitterness of the high-priestly faction against the Christians was too deep to be affected by change of leader.

5. *The Death of James, the Brother of the Lord.*—Josephus reports this event as occurring in A.D. 62, in the interregnum between the death of Festus and the arrival of Albinus, his successor. The prime instigator was a son of Annas, the well-known high-priest of the Gospels, himself a high-priest appointed by Agrippa II. 'But the younger Ananus . . . was a bold man in his temper, and very audacious, and followed the sect of the Sadducees, who are more severe in punishing offenders than all other Jews, as I have already shown. As therefore Ananus was of such a disposition, he thought he had now a good opportunity (to show his authority), as Festus was now dead, and Albinus was still on the road, so he assembled the Sanhedrin of judges, and brought before them the brother of Jesus who was called Christ, whose name was James, and some others, and having accused them as breakers of the Law, he delivered them over to be stoned.'[1] The more moderate people resented this illegal act, and Ananus was deposed after only three months' occupancy of the high-priesthood. Hegesippus,[2] quoted by Eusebius,[3] gives a different version of James's death, in which the blame is laid at the door of 'some of the seven sects of the Jews,' including the 'Scribes and Pharisees.' This account also places it in close proximity to the destruction of Jerusalem. For various reasons both Schürer and Hölscher reject the story of Josephus; the former partly because the text itself is uncertain, and the latter because he regards the references to the Sadducees in the *Antiquities* as biased and less trustworthy than those in the *War*.

On the whole, therefore, while the martyrdom of James is not in doubt, the evidence is not sufficient to establish the high-priest's chief responsibility. Yet in presence of the absolutely reliable accounts of the merciless treatment of Paul by the high-priests only two or three years before the time to which Josephus's story belongs, such behaviour as that attributed to Ananus could provoke no astonishment.

[1] *Ant.*, xx. ix. 1. [2] *Circa* A.D. 160. [3] *H. E.*, ii. 23.

Conclusions

So far, then, as the period covered by the Acts of the Apostles is concerned, it does not seem difficult to form a picture of the attitude of the Sadducees towards the early Christians. At the outset they treated the new preachers and wonder-workers with comparative mildness, only chastising them and forbidding them to preach in the Name of Jesus. Perhaps they regarded the movement as but the inevitable retort of fanatics whose leader they had destroyed and who would soon grow weary. In any case, the high-priests were confronted on the one hand with the enthusiasm of the multitude, always susceptible to the wonder-worker, and on the other hand, the lethargy of the Pharisees, zealous only for the Law, and who saw no reason for being troubled by the actions of Christians who kept the Law. As yet, therefore, they could do nothing and must wait their time. The change came when Stephen, by his alleged attack on the Law, roused the ire of both Pharisees and people, the result being a great persecution, of which one of the most enthusiastic leaders was Saul the Pharisee. Henceforward all was plain sailing: the Pharisees recognized the threat to their strict interpretation of the Law, and, as usual, the people followed, the Sadducees gladly co-operating.

For the most part the antagonism of the Sadducees was not induced by religious considerations, though naturally they liked the new sect none the better for their teaching of the resurrection. But they were strongly opposed to disturbances proceeding from any cause whatsoever, and in order to safeguard their own position associated themselves with the Romans in keeping the peace. Hölscher's assertion that their conduct in the Acts is entirely different from that in the Gospels cannot be substantiated. Their actions were from their own point of view quite consistent throughout. It was when Jesus became, as they believed, a menace to the public peace, and only then, that they intervened. At that point they began immediately to plot His death, and waited only till the feeling of the populace made it possible to effect this without disturbance or popular complaint. So in the Acts, having identified the new sect with the Galilean fanatic whom they had destroyed, they steadily set about its extermination, and left no stone unturned to accomplish their fell purpose. This

view is supported by Rackham, who says: 'The Sadducean aristocracy had ignored the Lord until the enthusiasm He aroused in the people threatened to precipitate a crisis. Even then they were held back by the people. And it was only by the aid of treachery and by cajoling the mob for the moment that they secured His crucifixion. And now a few weeks later history seems repeating itself. The disciples of Jesus enjoy the favour of the people; they teach publicly that Jesus is the Messiah and they boldly accuse the rulers of having crucified Him. There was no little danger that a tumult might arise and the people demand His blood at their hands. Filled with alarm for themselves, and jealousy of new and rival Rabbis, they arrest the apostles, but by surprise and without violence, and for fear of the people they are compelled to let them go.[1]

[1] See Acts iii. 17; iv. 10; v. 28; iv. 2; v. 17; iv. 21; v. 26. Rackham, *Com. Acts*, p. 45.

Chapter IX

GENERAL ESTIMATE

It must be obvious to the reader that we cannot dismiss the story of these two parties as a merely deplorable and unseemly religious feud without justification and without issue. A struggle which lasted for a couple of centuries; which persisted despite varying fortunes and under Governments unfavourable to one or both parties; in which it is difficult to say whether success or failure had the more inspiring effect; which never once throughout its whole history showed the slightest disposition to compromise or exhaustion—such a controversy must be treated as more than a mere explosion of bad temper or clash of shallow theories. It was in fact much more than this.

In forming one's estimate of such a contest two questions may reasonably be asked: first, as to the points at issue and the manner in which they were contested, did the disputants behave themselves worthily, and if not, where did they fail? And secondly, what became of the principles for which they fought so strenuously; did the one side succeed and the other fail to establish their position, or did they or their successors hit upon some happy mean and so secure advantages which compensated for so long and devastating a feud?

I. As Controversialists

The occasion of the cleavage was, as we have sought to show, the threat of Hellenization, but in reality this only brought into clearer light an already existing divergence in tendency and outlook. Hellenism is no figment of the imagination. In one form or another its fascination has swooped down upon religious communities in all ages, to allure some and terrify others. And the arguments for and against have always been the same. In the present case it was the high-priestly coterie which elected for 'extensiveness' and the Hasidim for 'intensiveness.' In course of time, under the

influence of the allurement, the tendencies on either side hardened into principles, or at least opposing lines of thought and activity. The stricter section became more and more scrupulous in observing and even increasing the demands of the Law, and the less strict in self-justification also took up a definite position, insisting that only the Written Law possessed authoritative obligation. Begun thus, on clearly marked lines of divergence, the battle was fought out to the bitter end and without thought of concession or yielding.

It is no matter of surprise that in the bitterness of the dispute both sides sometimes stooped to the meanness of revenging themselves on each other when the fortune of war placed them in power. Attention has been called to specific instances of this lapse in temper, pre-eminently in the period of the later Hasmonean rulers. It is usual, too, to emphasize the unpatriotic acquiescence of the early Sadducees, or their precursors the Hellenizers, when Antiochus Epiphanes attempted to extinguish the vital elements in Jewish national life. But the cruel sufferings of this party under Herod the Great, while their opponents somehow escaped unscathed, does something to redeem their reputation. Each side took hard blows from their foes without wavering : the Pharisees under the oppression of many Hasmonean monarchs and the supercilious tolerance of the Romans ; the Sadducees from the persecution under Salome and the active hostility of Herod. Right or wrong in their views, both were prepared to suffer for them. And if it be said in criticism that the Sadducees attained at length to wealth and power, it is to be remembered that the Pharisees also had their compensations, the compensations they prized most highly, viz. the right to serve Jehovah as their consciences directed and, with it, the admiration of a religiously-minded populace.

The greatest indignity from which controversialists can suffer—to be ignored by the larger public which looks on—both escaped. Pharisees and Sadducees as such came to an end in due course, and the tide of Judaism rolled on, but it remained for all time affected by the struggle which had been fought out so keenly before all eyes. And if the Pharisees are to be proclaimed the progenitors of later Judaism, it may be claimed for their adversaries that they so impressed the nation with their point of view that it was in principle tacitly

accepted. All future enactments had to submit to verification from the Written Laws of Moses.

II. The Fate of their Principles

1. It is more than a little unfortunate that in depicting the victory of Pharisaism the majority of writers have asserted the merely negative character of Sadduceeism. This may be only what was to be expected from the point of view adopted, but it is none the less unjust. One even wonders whether the term 'Sadduceeism' is not misleading, as it implies the introduction of a new set of principles, and the Sadducees had none new. As a matter of fact they maintained, as its official representatives, the accepted principles of the Jewish religion and refused to tolerate the innovations of the Pharisees. They may have been mistaken in this conservative attitude—probably were so to some extent—but there still remained to them the whole contents of their fathers' faith. To speak of this, therefore, as merely negative is surely a misuse of terms. If they declined the accretions of the Pharisees they had in their hands the whole of the Old Testament then canonized. As history tells us, they were less rigid in practice than in theory, as when in power they are said to have tolerated some Pharisaic ordinances, in order to retain influence with the people. But this was only an act of prudence and left their convictions unaltered.

The chief weakness of which the Sadducees were and are accused was their friendliness with Hellenism. And this must stand. Hellenism, as we know, was a grave danger, though perhaps it did not appear so serious in their eyes as to writers in later days. Nevertheless their risky experiment failed. Probably they were not strong enough to absorb it as Christians did in a later age. But the Pharisees also felt its force, and though resisting it as their worst foe did not entirely escape its influence. For, all unconsciously, they permitted Hellenistic ideas concerning the future life to affect their own views on this subject in a way which they would have resented had it occurred in their rivals. The Sadducees, on the other hand, openly and avowedly showed their friendliness to the outsider and tried to live on terms of amity with him.

The Sadducees' home and the centre of their glory was undoubtedly the Temple, with its ritual worship and

sacrifices. In the ancient days of Solomon its uprising had signalized the climax of the divine favour, and in the days of exile its loss summed up their sense of desolation and its anticipated re-establishment the inspiration of high endeavour. Now, under the influence of Pharisaic teaching and the growing importance of the Synagogue, its glory waned as the thoughts of the nation steadily moved away from it. But the Sadducees stood by it as long as they were permitted—to them the flag and symbol of national and religious hope. And when it was finally destroyed they disappeared in the débris. Yet, a writer like R. Travers Herford finds it possible to say: 'Spiritually, Judaism stood to gain rather than to lose, by the disappearance of the Sadducees.'[1]

2. The Pharisees contended for the Law, written and oral, and achieved marvellous success. This is their abiding and crowning glory.

Whether they ought to be saddled with responsibility for the disappearance from the nation of the genuinely prophetic spirit is uncertain. Not many, we think, will follow Herford, who, while quite properly asserting the need of the time for the Scribal type of leader, declares: 'If there were no prophets after the ancient manner, in the times when the Law was supreme, there was no need of prophecy of that type.'[2] Canon Charles regards the rise of Apocalyptic as the later substitute for Prophecy, and believes it to have been a Pharisaic product. But with all its merits it was a poor exchange. Nevertheless we cannot think that Pharisaism was so much the cause as itself one of the effects of the disappearance of the prophetic spirit. It was the earlier legalistic conception of religion which, when attacked by the Hellenistic foe, gave birth to Pharisaism. Excessive legalism in religion is the penalty of lack of vision and communion with God, and had the Pharisees (these children of legalism) been men of the type of the greater prophets and psalmists they would, like them, have kept and loved the Law without being enslaved by it. But the disparagement of prophecy was not a new feature in the second century, as readers of the later half of Zechariah[3] are well aware. Legalists and prophets rarely flourish at the same time, and it was perhaps because of the predominance of

[1] *Effect of Fall of Jerus. upon the Character of the Phars.*, p. 8.
[2] Ibid., p. 7.
[3] *Vide* Zech. xiii. 2–6.

legalism that Apocalyptic was so weak on the inspirational side as compared with the old prophecy. Herford, however, seems to express an extreme view when he says: 'Apocalypse, wherever it is found, is a symptom of weakness and not of strength; it is the work of writers whose minds were morbidly overstrained, under the pressure of calamity or the burden of the world's evil.[1] The Pharisees' proper responsibility, so far as we can see it, is that they did so little to bring back those elements of vision and the 'sense of God' which were largely lost when prophecy vanished.

The true sphere of the Pharisees was the Synagogue. They could not ignore the Temple; not even the Essenes went so far as that; but in practice they belittled it. And in that fact one finds a serious difficulty. It is quite customary to eulogize Pharisaism because by their gradual withdrawal from the Temple and its sacrifices they made it easier for the Jews to sustain the loss after A.D. 70. Thus, to refer to Herford again, he tells us that, apart from the natural grief which every Jew felt at the fate of Jerusalem and the Temple, '. . . in other respects it made less difference to the Pharisees than to any other class of the community.'[2] We believe this to be true, and from the standpoint of universal religion it is a fact on which they can be congratulated. But though a splendid contribution to religious progress, was it in keeping with fidelity to the Law? The whole legal system from early days had been based on sacrifices and bound up with the Temple. If, therefore, the history of Pharisaism was a preparation for, and led up to, the time when sacrifices should be no longer possible, it had, rightly or wrongly, manifestly broken with the Law and from a legal standpoint was quite properly opposed by the high-priests. The Pharisees were guilty of a revolutionary perversion of their religion, not a natural development of it.

Much has been said of late, by Jewish writers especially, in defence of the spirit in which the people obeyed the Pharisaic regulations. Christian writers have sometimes drawn attention to those curious modifications of Sabbath restrictions and cleansings which seem to show how burdensome these were in practice. But Montefiore, Loewe, and others protest that this supposition is erroneous, and one would gladly accept their

[1] Herford, *Effect of Fall, &c.*, p. 14 f. [2] Herford, op. cit., p. 17.

testimony. Loewe, for instance, says: 'But no orthodox Jew feels the Sabbath to be anything but a day of true delight, awaited with eagerness and welcomed as a "bride." And this delight can be realized only from within. No non-Jew is competent to describe it, for this experience is one which he can never have enjoyed.'[1] And yet the suspicion remains that all the well-known evasions, adaptations, and modifications are hardly to be interpreted as tokens of glad acquiescence in the many commands.

Sincere acknowledgement must be made of the share of the Pharisees in the development of some great doctrines, notably those of the Future Life and the Messiah. In this last the Sadducees had, as we have shown, a worthier share than is usually supposed. And however much Herford and others may despise Apocalyptic, it was in this class of literature that these new ideas found their best and chief expression. The views of the future life were naturally neither quite clear nor altogether consistent, but they reveal a true spiritual instinct and one which might have been utilized more frequently with advantage to the world. The Messiah, in the hands of the Pharisees, came to be a purely human son of David, and this conception doubtless embarrassed them in presence of the Prophet from Nazareth, but their main difficulties in this matter were deeper and more fundamental.

On the whole, one would rank as perhaps their greatest contribution to true religion an unquenchable belief in God. Under the terrible disappointments of the Hasmonean and Herodian periods they never ceased to hope in Him, and even when stunned by Pompey's desecration and, later, by the utter destruction of City and Temple, their faith survived the blow. To refuse the temptation 'to curse God and die' and, instead, to interpret all these disasters as the just punishment of human sin was a great act of faith. Thus have the profoundest believers triumphed in all ages.

The faults of the Pharisees, like those of their opponents, have been proclaimed from every housetop and one need neither, wonder at this nor greatly deplore it. Their errors were numerous and grave. But their virtues call for equal recognition. The legacy left to future generations is a rich one, and is carefully and jealously guarded in modern Judaism.

[1] Loewe, art. 'Judaism,' *E. R. E.*, vii., p. 588.

PART II

THE SAMARITANS

SYNOPSIS OF PART II

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

PAGE

Were the Samaritans part of the Israelite Community?—Arguments based on race and religion—Answer in the affirmative 183

CHAPTER II

SOURCES AND NAME

I. Sources. Old Testament and New Testament—Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha—Josephus—Samaritan literature—Papyri and Inscriptions 185

II. Name. Its derivation—Its application—'Kutheans' a derisive term 185

CHAPTER III

HISTORY

§ *I. The Assyrian Invasion and its Results*

(1) First deportation by Tiglath Pileser III in 734 B.C. . . . 187

(2) Second deportation in 721 B.C.—Number taken—Large remnant—Importations and their influence 187

(3) Immigrants of later date; no further deportations . . . 189

Incidental allusions showing how large the remnant was:

(*a*) Hezekiah's Reforms 191

(*b*) Josiah's Reforms 191

(*c*) Deputation from Shechem 192

(*d*) Transfers from Judaism to Samaritanism . . . 192

CHAPTER IV

HISTORY (*continued*)

§ *II. Incidents Connected with the Rebuilding of the Temple and Walls of Jerusalem*

The Ezra-Nehemiah document—Its character and difficulty . . . 194

I. Rebuilding of the Temple:

Ezra's account 195

Haggai and Zechariah (i.–viii.)—Rothstein's suggestion—All evidence from Jewish sources—No Samaritan antagonism 197

II. Rebuilding of the Walls:

(1) An earlier alleged attempt 198

(2) Another effort stopped—Opponents—Reason for opposing 198

(3) Success under Nehemiah—Opposition led by Sanballat, Tobiah, and Geshem—Political not religious reasons—Jewish triumph 200

CHAPTER V

HISTORY (*continued*)

§ *III. Religious Feud and Final Separation from the Jews*

I. Traces of the conflict in Prophetic literature:

(1) Book of Malachi 206

(2) Trito-Isaiah (chaps. lvi.–lxvi.) 207

(*a*) Passages showing friendliness to Outsiders . . . 207

(*b*) Attempts to bring the Samaritans back 208

PAGE
(*c*) Keen criticism of Samaritan practices 208
(*d*) Remarkable and difficult section (lxiii. 7–lxiv. 12)—Does it contain a passage of Samaritan origin?—L. E. Browne . 209
(*e*) Allusions to Gerizim temple 211
Light thrown on relations between the two peoples . . 212
(3) Book of Ruth—Not an idyll only 213
II. *Divisive elements at work.* The Temple had little effect—The Wall more disturbing—Nehemiah's prohibition of inter-marriage aroused keen antagonism 213
(1) Ezra's Law—Ezra's date discussed—Probably as late as 397 B.C.—This makes the development plainer 216
(2) Opposition from both Jews and Samaritans 216
III. *Final severance.* Temple built on Mount Gerizim—The only possible sequel 218
Nehemiah's account, meagre 220
Josephus' detailed story 221
How are these accounts reconciled? 222
Arguments in favour of Josephus' date *circa* 330 B.C. . . . 222

CHAPTER VI

History (*continued*)

§ *IV.* *Greek, Egyptian, Syrian and Maccabean Times*

Josephus almost our sole authority and he is biassed—Alexander's time—Hardship under his successors—Yet the two parties embittered towards each other 227
Persecution under Antiochus Epiphanes—Gerizim Temple paganized—Josephus *versus* 2 Macc. 228
Sirach—Test. of Levi—John Hyrcanus destroys Gerizim Temple and annihilates Samaria—Effect on religion 230

CHAPTER VII

History (*continued*)

§ *V.* *Roman and Later Times*

Jews oppress Samaritans—Roman deliverance in 63 B.C.—Privileges granted by Romans: Senate, Samaria rebuilt—Samaritan loyalty—Samaritans defile the Jewish Temple 232
Pilate and Samaritan fanatics—Galilean pilgrims—Samaritans join Jews in Great War 233
Oppose them in Bar Cochba's rebellion—Subsequent miseries—Persecute Christians 234
Middle Ages—Conditions to-day 235

CHAPTER VIII

Doctrines and Institutions

I. *Doctrines.* Fundamentally similar to those of Jews—Rejected second and third Jewish Canons—Pentateuch not 'borrowed'—Factors in development—Samaritan Pentateuch our chief Source: . . 237
(*a*) God Spiritual—One—Against anthropomorphisms—Charge of Idolatry groundless—Angels 239
(*b*) Moses—Unique position 241
(*c*) The Law, i.e. the Pentateuch—Opposed to Traditions—Veneration for Law—Conformity to it—Exalted conception of . . . 242
(*d*) Mount Gerizim—Sacred associations of it and Shechem—Contest with Jerusalem 244
(*e*) Eschatology, including the Messiah—Messiah expected—History divided into four great periods—Taheb or Shaheb, their name for Messiah—To come from House of Joseph—Yet not equal to Moses—Expected progress of events 246

PAGE

II. Institutions. Similar to Jews'—Strictly maintained—Passover—Dr. D. Katibah's account 249

CHAPTER IX

Relations with Jesus and the Early Christians

New Testament neglected somewhat—Survey of its documents: Synoptics, Fourth Gospel, Acts—Relations between Jews and Samaritans very bitter at this time 251

I. Relations with Jesus—Passages examined:

(1) Matt. x. 5—Prohibition by Jesus—Reasons 252
(2) Luke ix. 51 ff.—Churlish villagers—The other village . . 253
(3) Luke x. 25 ff.—Good Samaritan 254
(4) Luke xvii. 11 ff.—The grateful Samaritan leper—The nine Jews 254
(5) John iv. 4–42—The Woman at the Well—Sychar . . . 254
(6) John viii. 48—The Jews call Jesus a Samaritan . . . 256
Conclusions 257

II. Relations with the Early Christians:

(1) Acts i. 8—Samaria now to be evangelized 258
(2) Acts viii. 4–25—Philip, Peter, and John at Samaria—Church founded—Simon Magus 258
(3) Acts ix. 31—Growth of Samaritan Church 260
(4) Acts xv. 3—Samaritans welcome news of Gentile conversions . 260
Conclusions 261

CHAPTER X

Samaritan Literature

I. The Pentateuch—Early existence of—Early Christian writers—Ancient copy now at Nablus—Language of—Relation to Jewish Pentateuch—When first received 262
Translations of: Samaritan—Greek—Arabic 263

II. Chronicles:

(*a*) Book of Joshua—A kind of history 264
(*b*) Toledoth or Generations—The Calendar 264
(*c*) Chronicle of Abu'l Fath—1355—History 265

III. Other extant literature. Commentaries—Liturgies—Hymns . . 265

Chapter I

INTRODUCTION

It has always been a matter of dispute whether we are justified in regarding the Samaritans as part of the Israelite community. The Samaritans themselves emphatically claim this relationship, and the Jews, both ancient and modern, just as emphatically deny it. The majority of scholars assume, with but little attempt at proof, that the latter are in the right, and treat the Samaritans as more or less a Gentile race with a slight admixture of Israelite blood. It is interesting, therefore, to find that two of the latest and most important writers on the subject, J. A. Montgomery and J. E. H. Thomson, have had the temerity to challenge this almost universal verdict and advance good reasons for its reconsideration.

The arguments in support of the common opinion are based mainly on race and religion. Now it cannot be denied that the Samaritans did become to some extent a mixed race. As is well known, the Assyrian conqueror[1] replaced the deported Northerners with people from different parts of his Empire, and it is quite probable that once the earlier hostility of the Samaritans had cooled down they intermarried with them. But the history of the South (i.e. of the Jews) was not very different. After the best of the Jews had been taken into captivity by the Chaldeans in 597 and 586 B.C., great numbers of the surrounding tribes swarmed into the desolated regions, brushed aside all resistance and settled there. Then, as in the North, intermarriage followed, a fact to which Nehemiah bears witness and which caused him acute distress. And whether those who returned from exile, in 538 B.C. and subsequent years, were many or few, they were but a small number compared with the population who had never left home and of whom the future Jewish Church was of necessity largely

[1] Cf. 721 B.C.

composed. It would seem, therefore, that, both in North and South, purity of blood was at most only a question of degree.

Turning to the second reason, viz. the alleged difference in religion, it is obvious to an unprejudiced observer that broadly and fundamentally North and South were of one and the same faith, and that such differences as were found later were due mainly to differences in development, or non-development. And when it is borne in mind that the Samaritans are sometimes mistaken in later days for Sadducees, and this by Jews themselves, it is evident that however important the cleavage in belief it was not fundamental. The Samaritans, on their part, have always claimed to be true to their ancestral Israelite faith, more faithful indeed than their Southern fellow-countrymen. And many Jews frankly admit that they have continued throughout most devoted followers of Jehovah and His Law as given in the Pentateuch—their one and only Law-Book—though they complain of them, as of the Sadducees, that they have failed to accept later developments. The age-long grievance between the two is, of course, the ' schismatic ' Temple at Gerizim, but even here the Samaritans are not without some show of reason on their side. They maintain, rightly or wrongly, that Gerizim was the place originally chosen by Jehovah for the remembrance of His name and the offering of sacrifices, and, further, that in any case they were excluded from all participation in the erection of the second Temple at Jerusalem by the hostility of the Jews themselves. What truth there is on either side will appear as we discuss the historical relationships of the two parties, but meantime it will be seen that the Samaritans are far from being without a case, as is commonly assumed.

Chapter II

SOURCES AND NAME

I. Sources

Our chief sources of information are (1) the Books of the Old and New Testaments, especially Kings, Chronicles, Ezra-Nehemiah, Isaiah, the Gospels, and the Acts of the Apostles; (2) the Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha; (3) Josephus: *Antiquities* and *Jewish War*; (4) the Samaritan literature mentioned below in chapter ix.; and (5) the Papyri and Inscriptions.

II. Name

The name 'Samaritans' is derived from the Greek word Σαμαρεῖται (Samareitai), which is an attempted transliteration of the Hebrew word in the Old Testament. There we are told that Omri 'bought the hill Samaria (שמרון) of Shemer (שמר) for two talents of silver; and he built on the hill, and called the name of the city which he built after the name of Shemer, the owner of the hill, Samaria.'[1] The name of the town, therefore, was Shōmeron (שמרון) and that of the inhabitants Shōmerim (שמרים), once[2] Shōmeronim (שמרנים). The later Jewish Rabbis used to speak of them as Kuthim (כותים), or Cuthites, but this was intended as a stigma to indicate the Jewish belief that the Samaritans all come from Kuthah (Cuthah) in Assyria.

The application of the name varied from time to time. At first it probably referred only to the town of Samaria; then it was used for the whole of the northern province; still later it was restricted to those who sided with the Samaritans in their dispute with the Jews and worshipped at Mount Gerizim and not at Jerusalem.

The names by which the Samaritans designated themselves were two: 'Children of Israel' (בני־ישראל) and 'keepers' (שמרים—Shōmerim), i.e. of the Law.

[1] 1 Kings xvi. 24. [2] 2 Kings xvii. 29.

Chapter III

HISTORY

Section I. The Assyrian Invasion and its Results

There is no need to restate the earliest history of the Samaritans. From the time when the Northern tribes separated from the Southern down to the Assyrian invasion, Samaritan history is merged in that of the whole of the northern kingdom. And, however much the North might lie open to criticism because of its political or religious separateness, none could contest its right to the name of Israelite during those years. The disputed part of their history begins with the coming of the Assyrians, and to it we therefore turn.

The undisputed facts may be stated briefly. These are that the Assyrians invaded the northern Israelite Kingdom on more than one occasion and deported, as was their custom, great numbers of its inhabitants to Mesopotamia and Media; and then, to fill up the depopulated regions, they introduced strangers from different parts of the Empire and settled them in Samaria.

The conclusion based on these facts, one which may be traced as far back as the Book of Kings and the Ezra–Nehemiah document, is that the whole Northern province was so depopulated of its Israelite inhabitants, and so swamped racially and religiously by the new-comers, that it entirely lost its real Israelite character and became practically Gentile.

Is this far-reaching conclusion justified? Our chief witnesses are the Second Book of Kings and the Assyrian Inscriptions, and both require discriminating treatment. There is no known reason for suspecting bias towards Samaritan or Jew in the Inscriptions, though one would not be surprised to find that they exaggerated the greatness of the Assyrian

triumph. With the Book of Kings it is different. Its editor was a Southerner, and would naturally follow his Jewish sources. Moreover, by the time he wrote, enmity had developed between the Southerners and the Northern remnant (or, as he would call them, new-comers), so that one can hardly expect his record to be of an unprejudiced character.

First Deportation

1. The first deportation recorded was by Tiglath Pileser III, who in 734 B.C. conquered Gilead, Naphtali, and the district of Galilee, 'and carried them captive to Assyria.' The Chronicler adds details which apparently refer to the east of Jordan.[1] In the Inscriptions Tiglath Pileser goes far beyond the Jewish record, claiming to have deported the whole of the inhabitants of the land of Omri (i.e. the Northern Kingdom) and their property to Assyria.[2] The absurdity of such a statement is at once seen when we find how many were still left to be deported by Sargon. And in any case, the district round about Samaria, the capital, is not referred to. It is to be noted also that in neither account is there any mention of Assyrian or any other settlers introduced to fill up the vacated regions.

Second Deportation

2. The second and more important deportation occurred in the reign of Sargon, about 722 or 721 B.C. In this instance it was the turn of 'the cities of Samaria' to suffer. The Editor of the Book of Kings seems to have relied mainly on two documents for his information, one known as the 'Book of the Chronicles of the Kings of Israel,' and the other composed by one or other of the 'Deuteronomists.' But as the 'Deuteronomist' himself refers to the captivity of Judah,[3] his work cannot be dated before that event in 586 B.C., and may be much later. This of course, implies that at the earliest the Book of the Kings was edited 130 or 140 years later than the event under consideration. It is important to note this, because the statement of the earlier of these two sources is somewhat vague about the number of those deported, whereas the later 'Deuteronomist' is quite definite. The former reports in general terms that 'the King of Assyria took Samaria and carried Israel away unto Assyria,' &c.,[4] but the 'Deuteronomist,'

[1] 2 Kings xv. 29; 1 Chron. v. 26.
[2] Schrader, *C. O. T.*, i. 247 f.
[3] *Vide* 2 Kings xvii. 19 and 20.
[4] 2 Kings xvii. 6.

possibly influenced by the growing Jewish enmity against the Northerners, goes so far as to say: 'there was none left but the tribe of Judah only.'[1] Now, on comparing these statements with Sargon's own inscription, we find that the conqueror himself, who was hardly likely to minimize his exploit, is much more modest and probably more accurate in his claim than the 'Deuteronomist.' His words are: 'I besieged and captured the town of Samaria; 27,280 of their inhabitants I carried away; 50 chariots I took as my royal share,' &c.[2]

Assuming then the approximate accuracy of Sargon's figure, it is incredible that this represents the total population of the Northern nation, even after making allowance for its earlier losses. An incident, which had occurred only a few years before, recorded in 2 Kings xv. 19 f., justifies this conclusion. There we are told that the Assyrian monarch Tiglath Pileser (or Pul) extracted as tribute from the Northern King Menahem (*circa* 738 B.C.) 1,000 talents of silver. Menahem obtained this by impositions of 50 shekels each from 'all the mighty men of wealth.' A simple calculation [3] shows that this implies no less than 60,000 contributors. And if we add the humble and poor of the land to 'the mighty men of wealth,' it will be seen at once that Sargon's captives were only a moderate proportion of the total population, and this, too, apart from women and children. Another comparison may be made by reference to the statement of Sennacherib, who, a few years later, claimed to have removed from Judea no fewer than '200,150 men, great and small, of male and female sex,' &c.[4] So that if Sargon's 27,280 represented the entire population of Samaria, it would imply that Judea contained a much larger population than the Northern Kingdom with its greater area, and for such an estimate we are unaware of any justification. And to this must be added the important fact that even after these 200,000 Judeans had been removed the life of the Southern province continued with little noticeable change.

One is therefore forced to the conclusion that, however large the number of the Northern population removed to Mesopotamia and Media by Sargon, by far the greater portion

[1] 2 Kings xvii. 18.
[2] *Vide* Schrader, *C.O.T.*, i. p. 266.
[3] The talent was worth about 3,000 shekels.
[4] *Vide* Schrader, *C.O.T.*, i. p. 286.

were left behind. Probably the more influential, such as the nobles, the wealthy, and the priests, were taken, and the peasantry, being more concerned with agriculture than with politics and consequently harmless, left behind. Sargon then imported strangers from various parts of his domains, from Kuthah, Avva, Hamath, and Sepharvaim, probably of a social position corresponding to that of those displaced, to take up their abode in the midst of the peasant remnant.

For some time those left in the land would probably hold themselves aloof from the strangers, but in the long run this passed away and the two sections intermixed. The foreigners, in accordance with an ancient Semitic idea, soon recognized that they must pay homage to Jehovah, the God of the land into which they had come, and, in response to their request, some of the exiled priests were sent back by the Assyrian king to instruct them in the worship of Jehovah. As they would also retain the chief customs of their native religions, a curious amalgam must have been the result, and this was bound to react injuriously on the Jehovah-worship of the Samaritans. For, if the new-comers incorporated some Jehovistic elements into their practices, to save them from the vengeance of the God of the land, the Samaritans in their turn, influenced by proximity and friendliness due to intermarriage, would adopt some of the customs of their new neighbours. And this it was, no doubt, which made them the object of Jewish contempt. But syncretism was no new feature in the Israelite religion, whether of North or South. From earliest times the pure worship of Jehovah had always been seriously jeopardized by the tendency of the people to imitate the beliefs and practices of their neighbours, the Canaanites. And even after the Northern captivity the religion of the Southerners passed into an exceedingly dark and impure period during the reign of Manasseh. Nevertheless, as we believe the evidence shows, both North and South emerged, if not unhurt, yet sufficiently devoted to their ancient faith to leave no doubt about their fundamental loyalty.

Immigrants of Later Dates

3. Another reference to foreign immigrants is found in Ezra, though no mention is made of any corresponding deportations.

The passages are connected with the rebuilding of the Temple and the city walls, and may be quoted :

> Now when the adversaries of Judah and Benjamin heard that the children of the captivity builded a Temple unto the Lord, the God of Israel ; then they drew near unto Zerubbabel, and to the heads of the fathers' houses, and said unto them, Let us build with you : for we seek your God, as ye do ; and we do sacrifice unto Him since the days of Esar-haddon, king of Assyria, which brought us up hither.
>
> . . . . . .
>
> The nations whom the great and noble Osnappar brought over and set in the city of Samaria and in the rest of the country beyond the river.[1]

It is evident that the feeling of the original writers used by the Compiler is one of contempt for the persons referred to. They are designated 'the adversaries of Judah and Benjamin,' and 'the people of the Land,'[2] though whether the same people are meant in each case is uncertain. The former are said to attribute their importation to Esar-haddon, who was king of Assyria from 681 to 668 B.C. No other mention is made of this importation in the Old Testament, but there is nothing improbable in it. In the other passage they ascribe their presence to Osnappar, by whom possibly Ashurbanipal is intended, who reigned over Assyria from 668 to 626 B.C. In both cases, it is the new-comers or their descendants who are referred to. Putting together the two statements we reach this result : the two immigrations took place some time between 681 and 626 B.C., the opposition to the rebuilding of the Temple and walls in 536 B.C. and later, and the Book in which the whole is recorded was written about 330 B.C., by which time the Samaritans were wholly separated from the Jews and regarded by them as quite 'outside the pale.' It will be observed that the attitude of the original Samaritans, i.e. those who remained after the deportations, is completely ignored, though quite probably the Jewish Chronicler intended his description to include all who dwelt in Samaria.

[1] Ezra iv. 1 f., iv. 10. [2] Ezra iv. 4.

The Remnant

The only legitimate and certain conclusion which one can draw is quite contrary to the idea that in the intervening years the Samaritans had allowed themselves to be overwhelmed by the immigrants. Indeed, the zeal of the new-comers to assist in the building of the Jewish Temple seems only comprehensible on the assumption that a large remnant of the original Samaritans remained as an active and propagandist religious force. Otherwise, their neighbours would have hardly have seen in the contemplated erection of the Southern Temple an object which they would be concerned to support.

There are several incidental allusions in the Old Testament which go far to corroborate this conclusion, and which would be extremely difficult to explain on any other theory.

(*a*) We may begin with the Reforms of Hezekiah, which embraced North as well as South. The date of this king is not easy to fix with anything approaching to certainty, but two of the latest writers on his reign, Curtis and Madsen,[1] assign it to *circa* 715–686 B.C. His Reforms seem to have been inspired not only by the shameful memory of the idolatries of his predecessor, Ahaz, but also by gratitude for his people's escape from the invader who had ravaged the North. Consequently, it was after the deportations of Samaritans and the importations of foreigners that his task was undertaken. Yet we observe that his summons to keep the Passover was sent to 'all Israel and Judah,' to 'Ephraim and Manasseh,' 'throughout all Israel from Beersheba even to Dan.'[2] And the ensuing destruction of the offending pillars, Asherim, high places, and altars, included Ephraim and Manasseh as well as Judah and Benjamin.[3] Not the least remarkable fact is that the record of these proceedings is preserved by the Jewish Chronicler himself. But how could such Reforms have been possible if the population of the North had been at that time mainly pagan, i.e. Assyrian? Reading the record without presuppositions, one would naturally conclude that North and South were alike in having declined in their loyalty to Jehovah, and this, of course, implies that both were of genuine Israelite origin.

(*b*) The later Reforms of Josiah (*circ.* 639-608 B.C.) reveal

[1] *Com. Chron., I. C. C.*, p. 462.
[2] 2 Chron. xxx. 1, 5, 10 f.
[3] 2 Chron. xxxi. 1.

no change in this respect. He, too, extended his zeal to Bethel and 'the cities of Samaria,'[1] so that though almost a century had passed, during which time the intermixing of the immigrants with the original Samaritans had had abundant opportunity for development, there was still little or no difference between the two parts of the nation. The Chronicler only confirms the account in Kings and gives more details.[2] How either Hezekiah or Josiah would have dared to interfere with the religious practices of a people which was predominantly Assyrian, as was the case according to the usual view, must be left to those who hold this view to explain. It is easily understood if the population remained mainly Samaritan.

(*c*) Again, we read in the Book of Jeremiah of a deputation of four score men 'from Shechem, from Shiloh, and from Samaria,' who came after the destruction of the Temple at Jerusalem 'with oblations and frankincense in their hands to bring them to the house of the Lord.'[3] Probably we are to understand that, though the sacred building had disappeared, some kind of worship was maintained on the site. But why should men who were originally heathen, and whose connexion with the Israelite faith was at most merely a superimposition, show such devotion, and at a time, too, when their devotion might have brought them into ill-odour with the foreign king? If, however, the deputation and those whom they represented belonged to the old Israelite stock, and were moved by patriotic sympathy, while remaining remarkable as an act of wonderful fidelity, the story yet enters into the realm of the comprehensible.

(*d*) One further fact remains to be noted, viz. the frequent and apparently easy transference of many Southerners to the North, when they found themselves inconvenienced by the marriage reforms of Nehemiah and Ezra; also, the ultimate erection of a Temple at Gerizim similar to that at Jerusalem, and with a member of the Jerusalem high-priestly family as its leading figure. What requires explanation is not only the mere fact or facts, but still more the atmosphere in which such events could take place without any noticeable sense of dislocation, or consciousness that those who thus passed from South to North were transferring themselves to what was,

[1] 2 Kings xxiii. 15, 19.
[2] 2 Chron. xxxiv. 6, 9, xxxv. 17 f.
[3] Jer. xli. 5.

despite its veneer of Judaism, fundamentally pagan. If, on the other hand, we are to suppose a condition of religious life in the North so nearly akin to that which obtained in the South that there was no material difference between the two, then we are confronted with a miracle of propagandist success. For this means according to the usual theory that a mere handful of Samaritans, too negligible to be removed by the conquerors in 721 B.C., with the assistance of one or two priests, had produced a religious approximation so close to that of the South that those who passed over found it practically indistinguishable from it.

Chapter IV

HISTORY (*continued*)

Section II. Incidents Connected With the Rebuilding of the Temple and Walls of Jerusalem

Our chief source for this period is the Ezra-Nehemiah document. It is indispensable to the student, as it deals with matters of critical importance, but unfortunately its value as history is in great dispute. The Editor of the book, as Sir G. A. Smith tells us, 'is to be identified with the Chronicler himself, whose date is about 300 B.C., or more than a century after Ezra and Nehemiah visited Jerusalem. Among the constituents of the Book are an historical summary written not in Hebrew, but in Aramaic; several "state-documents" in the direct form; and two long fragments of "Memoirs" in which Ezra and Nehemiah respectively speak in the first person singular. As suddenly as these "Memoirs" are introduced, so are they again broken off, but other parts of them appear to form the basis of narratives which continue their story, but introduce Ezra and Nehemiah in the third person. Nor . . . does the compiler observe the regular sequence of events. All these features, visible on the surface of Ezra–Nehemiah and complicated by others of a more subtle kind, have provoked what is perhaps the most considerable controversy in the past ten years of Old Testament scholarship.'[1]

It would take us too far afield to enter upon the discussion of these questions, and they are too complicated even to be summarized in a brief paragraph. Happily for our present purpose, with but few changes, the path is fairly clear.

Suffice it to say that we see no necessity for refusing to accept in general the outline of history which forms the framework of the book, despite the arguments of Kosters, Torrey,

[1] *Expos.*, VII. ii. 3 f.

and others. One important exception to this statement must, however, be made, viz. that the balance of evidence seems to the writer in favour of placing Ezra after and not before the intervention of Nehemiah,—thus following several French scholars supported by Hoonacker and Kosters.

Also, there is one section at least of Ezra, viz. iv. 7–23, which by common admission has got out of its proper place. As the reader will observe, it deals with the opposition to the rebuilding of the walls in the reign of Artaxerxes (who did not ascend to the throne until 464 B.C.), whereas the story it interrupts deals with the attempted rebuilding of the Temple, *circa* 537 B.C. Probably it ought to follow the last chapter in Ezra and precede the first in Nehemiah.

I. Rebuilding of the Temple.[1]

We take first of all Ezra's account of the first attempt to rebuild, which unhappily came to nought. Immediately after the arrival of the new-comers the altar was set up,[2] the feast of Tabernacles kept, daily sacrifices offered, and the set feasts observed.[3] Kosters, Cheyne, Torrey, and others deny the historicity of this statement, but, we think, without sufficient reason.

In the following year the foundation of the new Temple was laid. Then, we are told, 'adversaries' approached the Jewish builders with an offer to assist in the work, but were curtly rebuffed. In revenge they 'weakened the hands of the people of Judah, and troubled them in building, and hired counsellors against them, to frustrate their purpose, all the days of Cyrus, King of Persia, even until the reign of Darius, King of Persia.' And the work of rebuilding ceased.[4] The 'adversaries' referred to are generally understood to mean the Samaritans, and this is probably correct if the designation is properly interpreted. According to the record they were not the original Samaritans, but descendants of the new comers sent to Palestine by Esar-haddon.[5]

The verse which immediately follows (iv. 6) this story is incomprehensible as it stands, and no explanation so far has

[1] Cf. Ezra iv. 1–5, 24, v.–vi. 18; 1 Esdras v. 66–73; Haggai; Zech. i.–viii.

[2] Ezra iii. 3, which tells of the builders' fear of the neighbouring peoples presents a very uncertain text and no conclusion can be based upon it. Some writers would correct by a text of Esdras which changes its meaning altogether. Cf. Batten, *Com. Erza-Nehemiah*, pp. 108 and 113; Montgomery, *Samaritans*, p. 59, *n.*

[3] Ezra iii. 2–5. [4] Ezra iii. 10; iv. 1 ff., 4, 24. [5] 681–668 B.C.

succeeded in elucidating its meaning satisfactorily. It refers to the time of Ahasuerus (i.e. in all probability Xerxes, who reigned from 485 to 464 B.C.) and cannot be attached either to what precedes or to what follows. It is omitted by 1 Esdras, and probably had nothing to do with the Temple, and on the whole is better ignored. The next section (i.e. iv. 7–23), as already stated, belongs to a later stage of the history and contributes nothing to the present story.

The account of the rebuilding of the Temple is resumed in the following and longer section (Ezra v.–vi. 18). It narrates the second and, this time, successful attempt, under the impulse of the prophets Haggai and Zechariah. The work began in the year 520 and was brought to completion in 516 B.C. Tattenai, probably a Persian, and 'the governor beyond the river,' heard the news of the new movement with more than a little alarm, and even sent a letter of inquiry about it to Persian headquarters; but a favourable answer being received the work was continued, and at last successfully finished. There is no mention throughout these four years, it is important to note, of any Samaritan opposition.

This, then, is the account given by our document. It is of course the first story which attracts our attention, because the Samaritans are said to have hindered and arrested the work. But it is not without significance that when the Jews did accomplish their undertaking these alleged earlier antagonists in no way molested them.

Some writers decline to regard the record as a genuine piece of history. Cheyne, for instance, thinks that the Samaritans would not be sufficiently interested in the undertaking to offer help. E. Meyer[1] contends that the position of the Samaritans was so superior to that of the smaller and poorer Jewish folk that they would never have stooped to assist them. Had they done so, the Jews would have been only too eager to avail themselves of such unexpected aid. Others, again, doubt whether Cyrus would have reversed his permission to build so soon after granting it. But did he do so? We are certainly told that the 'adversaries' hindered the work and that it ceased, but no more. Was the alleged 'hindrance' used by the Jews as an excuse for faint-heartedness? As will appear, this is not impossible.

[1] *Entstehung*, p. 119 ff.

The little Books of the Prophets Haggai and Zechariah (i.–viii.) are an important aid at this point. It is noteworthy that neither writer attributes blame to the Samaritans for any interference with projects for rebuilding. On the contrary, their reproaches are wholly for the Jews themselves—their unbelief, selfish contentment with the existing condition of things, absorption in their own personal well-being, and such like—but no mention is made of the enmity of the Samaritans, or indeed of any other external foe.[1] Rothstein, in his recently published volume entitled *Juden und Samaritaner*, makes several interesting contributions to the exegesis of Haggai. For example, he regards the passage in ii. 10–14 as referring not, as generally understood, to unworthy Jews, but to Samaritans, who were eager to be associated with the building of the Temple. The former, he contends, could not properly be described as 'unclean,' though remiss and faint-hearted. Their slackness, bad as it was, had not outlawed them from God or made them liable to His outraged holiness. But such terms, he thinks, might be applied to Samaritans. This new interpretation would, of course, demand a redating of Ezra iii. 8 ff. and iv. 1 ff., but Rothstein is prepared for that. Whatever truth there may be in this suggestion, it points in the same direction as the omission from Haggai of any blame against the Samaritans for hindering the work of rebuilding. Had there been no genuine offer of help on the part of the Samaritans, and no inclination in the minds of some Jews to accept such assistance, Haggai would have had no need to show how polluting such help would be. The prophet is apparently taking the side of the stricter Jews and opposing those friendly to the Samaritans. Had the latter been open and avowed enemies the question could never have arisen.

In addition to this it must always be borne in mind that all the available evidence comes from Jewish sources, and, moreover, was finally edited when the schism between the two parties had become an accomplished fact.

On the whole, then, there seems more to be said than is usually allowed for a simple acceptance of the outstanding fact that the Samaritans did actually offer to help the Jews, and for the belief that this was genuinely intended. It may be that they changed later, and especially after being so severely

[1] Cf. Hag. i. 6–11.

rebuffed. But at the outset they simply beheld a number of their co-religionists returning to their native land and were drawn to them in sincere sympathy. Here were the upholders of the faith which many of them had been taught in childhood, and their fathers before them, and which others of their number had learnt from fathers who had voluntarily accepted it. What reason could such men have for opposing the erection of the Temple? They had none of their own, and the presence of a new and glorious Temple, such as was now proposed, would bring a lustre to their religion such as it had never possessed in the lifetime of any but the very oldest of their number. Further, remembering that the Pentateuch, which the Samaritans took over at the schism as their own Law-book, was not yet complete, it seems in every way improbable that there could have been any religious antagonism at this stage. 'The truth is,' as Cheyne remarks, 'that there is no evidence that in the earlier period there was any strong religious feud between the Jews and the Samaritans. . . . Nor is there any reason to think that the Samaritans ever gave up their interest in the great sanctuary of Judah until they were forced. . . . The story of their interfering with their kinsmen under pretence of a wish to co-operate is a pure imagination.'[1]

II. Rebuilding of the City Walls

Fortunately we now come to surer ground. There were certainly two, and possibly three, attempts to rebuild before the task was accomplished. It will be best to take these in the order in which they appear in our Ezra–Nehemiah document.

1. First we have that perplexing verse in Ezra[2] already mentioned, which may be an isolated fragment, preserved from an account of an early and frustrated attempt at restoration. But this supposition is little more than a guess, as the passage actually only tells of 'an accusation against the inhabitants of Judah and Jerusalem,' and it is therefore impossible to base anything upon it. The period it refers to is the reign of Xerxes,[3] i.e. prior to the visit of Nehemiah, but neither he nor Malachi, who belongs to that time, gives any clue to its meaning.

2. The second effort (or, if that just named be ignored, the first) is described in Ezra iv. 7–23, and is taken by the Compiler from the Aramaic document. The section would have been

[1] *J. R. L. after Exile*, p. 25 f. [2] Ezra iv. 6. [3] 485–464 B.C.

more suitably placed, as has been stated, at the end of the Book of Ezra. It informs us that some time between the advent of Artaxerxes to the Persian throne, and the coming of Nehemiah to Jerusalem (i.e. between 464 and 445 B.C.), the Jews actually began to rebuild the city walls. Towards the conclusion of the passage the writer states that the builders were afterwards made 'to cease by force and power,' so that it is clear a serious beginning was really made.[1] It seems probable, too, that their work became a matter of common knowledge even at Babylon. This would explain the astonishment and grief of Nehemiah when a few years later his friends told him of the condition of Jerusalem: 'The wall of Jerusalem also is broken down and the gates thereof are burned with fire.'[2] A report of the devastation produced by the historic disaster of 586 B.C. could hardly have astonished him, for with this he must have been well acquainted all his life. But apparently he had entertained great hope of this recent attempt to rebuild and had not heard of its utter failure.

How far the work progressed we are not told, but we may surmise that the news quickly reached the ears of the surrounding nations. For some reason not assigned, it displeased them, and they determined to arrest its progress if possible. To this end a letter was sent on their instance by the Persian officials in Palestine (Mithredath and others) to Artaxerxes, the king. In this letter the complainants describe themselves as immigrants brought into the land by 'the great and noble Osnappar,' a monarch who is better known to us under the name of Ashurbanipal.[3] They point out to the king that Jerusalem is a bad and rebellious city, and that for the Jews to rebuild the city walls might endanger the stability of the Empire at this outpost, and probably lead to refusal to pay tribute. They therefore respectfully urge the king to have the records searched, wherein he would find ample justification for their accusation. The king's response does not seem to have been long delayed. The archives were duly searched and the city's reputation proved to be as alleged. Hence the king ordered the work to be stopped immediately. The recipients of the reply proceeded at once to act upon this authorization, and the work on the city walls was arrested forthwith. And, judging by the

[1] Ezra iv. 23. [2] Neh. i. 3. [3] 668–626 B.C.

destruction reported to Nehemiah later, a good deal of what had been accomplished was destroyed.

But why, one asks, did the Samaritans and the others associated with them[1] take so violent a dislike to this reconstruction of the city of Jerusalem? Probably the answer is not far to seek, and, so far as can be seen, the reason had nothing to do with religious motives. Quite probably the earlier blunt refusal to permit the Samaritans to share in the rebuilding of the Temple had rankled, despite the fact that much friendliness had been maintained with many at Jerusalem. But the proposed erection of the walls was a more serious matter. It threatened a complete change in the relationship between the North and South. For a long time now Jerusalem had lost its pre-eminence, and this had passed over to Samaria. But if Jerusalem became once again a walled-city this much-prized status might be lost. And the Samaritans were not willing to suffer this deprivation without a severe struggle, and for the time triumphed.

3. The final and successful effort took place under the inspiration and leadership of Nehemiah.[2] This was in the twentieth year of Artaxerxes,[3] i.e. in 445 or 444 B.C. Once again they encountered opponents and from the same quarter. The leaders of the opposition were evidently well known, and are mentioned by name several times: Sanballat, the Horonite; Tobiah, the servant of the Ammonite; and Geshem (or Gashmu) the Arabian. In general they appear to represent the Samaritans, with, perhaps, the support of an Arabian tribe.

Sanballat, the Horonite, obviously occupied the first place.[4] The meaning of the ascription 'Horonite' is not quite clear, but it probably points to Beth Horon on the north-west of Jerusalem as his birth-place. Josephus calls him a Kuthean, but this only implies that he regards him as one of the many foreign immigrants into Samaria, and is of no historical value. The same writer goes on to say that Sanballat was 'sent into Samaria as satrap by Darius, the last king of Persia.'[5] As this Darius did not begin to reign until 335 B.C. it is evident either that Josephus is wrong in his dates or that there were two

[1] Ezra iv. 7, 9 f. [2] Cf. Neh. ii. 10–vii. 5. [3] 464–424 B.C.

[4] Neh. ii. 10, 19; iv. 1, 7; vi. 1, 2, 5, 12, 14. 'The name is Assyrian, Sinballidh, "the Moon-god has vivified"' (Sayce, *H.D.B.*, art. 'Sanballat').

[5] *Ant.*, XI. vii. 2.

satraps of the same name. Though Nehemiah nowhere calls Sanballat 'governor,' he is so described (*pekhah*) in the Sachau Papyri. It is usually supposed that he had at command some military force. But the word on which this conjecture is based[1] is capable of being translated 'aristocracy' or 'aristocrats,' and this would fit in quite well with the remainder of the sentence.[2] In the Sachau Elephantiné Papyri, already mentioned, we find the names of Sanballat's sons. The writers say: 'We have also all of us written concerning these matters in a letter in our name to Delaiah and Shelemiah, the sons of Sanballat, the governor of Samaria.'[3] Judging by their Jewish names, and particularly the addendum *iah* (from 'Jehovah'), one may reasonably conclude that not only was the whole family Jewish, but that they had continued worshippers of Jehovah.[4]

The second leader of the opposition was 'Tobiah, the servant, the Ammonite.'[5] The usual idea that he was a member of the tribe of the Ammonites may be true, but is not at all certain. G. A. Smith says of the term 'Ammonite': 'This may mean from Kephar Ha'ammoni, or village of the "Ammonite," which lay in the territory of Benjamin.'[6] If this conjecture is correct it makes Tobiah a Jew, like his master. His name, too, points in this direction, as it contains the name of Jehovah (*iah*), and means 'Jehovah is (my) good.' He is intimately associated with Sanballat through the whole incident, and was in all likelihood his secretary. He was also allied with Eliashib, the chief priest, his son was married to the daughter of a Jew, while he himself was the son-in-law of Shecaniah, the son of Arah. He was on excellent terms with the nobles of Judah, and had correspondence with them on delicate matters. Even after Nehemiah's first visit he was accorded special favour by Eliashib in being permitted to occupy a room in the Temple from which Nehemiah ejected him on his second visit.[7]

Geshem, or Gashmu, was the third leader of the opposition party.[8] He is spoken of as the 'Arabian,' and this is usually

[1] Cf. Ezra iv. 2 (Heb. iii. 34).

[2] G. A. Smith mentions another possible translation, based on the text of a Sept Codex (B) of Esdras (B) xiv. 4, which would run: 'Saying before his brethren, Is this the power of Samaria that these Jews are fortifying their city?' (*Jerus.*, iii., 336 f., and note; *vide* also *E. B.*, art. 'Sanballat').

[3] i. 29. [4] Cf. Batten, *Com. Ezra–Nehemiah*, p. 26; Torrey agrees.

[5] Neh. ii. 10, 19, iv. 3, 7, vi. 1, 12, 14, 17–19, xiii. 4, 7 f. [6] *Jerus.*, ii. 337.

[7] Neh. xiii. 4, 8. [8] Neh. ii. 19, vi. 1, 2, 6.

taken to indicate that he represented others than the Samaritans, who likewise objected to the rebuilding of the city walls. It is suggested by some writers that he had accepted the Samaritan faith, a conjecture due probably to the idea that the opposition sprang from religious motives. For this supposition of religious motive we find no warrant anywhere. The objectors' own language is much more reliable, especially as it is reported by a Jew: 'What is this thing that ye do? Will ye rebel against the king?'[1] An Arabian could join in such a question as well as a Samaritan.

Though but little is made of it, there were other objectors of various nationalities, viz. Arabians (in addition to Geshem) Ammonites, and Ashdodites. The opposition therefore was widespread, a fact which is of peculiar value to the student in revealing the line to be followed in his search for the underlying reason.

The development of the opposition is variously described. We are told that these men were angry and grieved, that they mocked the builders' enterprise, challenged their motives, undertook forcible measures to stop them, had resort to subterfuge, and finally promoted a conspiracy of nobles, prophets, and other notable persons within the city. But throughout it all Nehemiah remained inflexible. He refused to be moved by guile or intimidated by threats. His first reply is perhaps most characteristic: 'The God of Heaven He will prosper us; therefore we His servants will arise and build: but ye have no portion, nor right, nor memorial in Jerusalem.'[2]

Again, the question arises how this long-continued feud is to be accounted for. And the examination of this final episode goes far to confirm the answer already suggested. No doubt the chief foes of the 'builders' were the Samaritans, and quite possibly those who associated with them acted at their instigation. But the usual idea that the opposition was based on religious motives cannot, we think, be sustained. It was inspired almost entirely by political considerations. The remaining factor was probably jealousy. As Batten puts it: 'To account for this hostility there is no need to go back to the repulse of the Samaritans' offer to aid in building the Temple (Ezra iv. 1–3), still less to the later bitter feud between the Samaritans and the Jews. As Montgomery has pointed out

[1] Neh. ii. 19. [2] Neh. ii. 20.

in his able work on the Samaritans (page 59), the opposition was political, not religious. In the time of Nehemiah the relations of the Samaritans toward the Jews was exactly what the relations of the Northern Kingdom, the predecessors of the Samaritans, had always been to the Kingdom of Judah. The Exile, with the colonizing and the Return, had not materially altered the conditions. The Samaritans and Jews could no more be one people than Ephraim and Judah could long be one state. As shown above, the rival people picked no quarrel with their Southern neighbours as long as they were using their efforts to build up their ecclesiastical institutions. The Temple would not interfere with the political supremacy of the North. But the building of the walls was another matter. Once let Jerusalem be made impregnable again, as it had been in the days of old, and the balance of power would be almost certain to move from the North to the South. The Samaritans would have been blind indeed had they not seen the significance of the movement, and foolish indeed if they had not used every possible means to prevent it.'[1] Cheyne holds a like view.[2]

Until Nehemiah arrived, the well-established Samaritans and the recently reinforced colony of Jews had lived on friendly terms, despite the rebuff of a few years before. The erection of the Temple had apparently done little to mar this spirit, perhaps in one respect had even aided it by the impulse it gave to the religion which both parties professed. But the scheme which Nehemiah had at heart, and now proceeded to execute, threatened serious political changes. Moreover, the spirit of exclusiveness shown accentuated the inevitable sensitiveness of those deeply interested parties who watched the course of events. Samaria's pre-eminence in the future was challenged, a position it had held now for many generations. Jerusalem would supplant Samaria as the metropolis of the country, and the neighbours of the long-depressed Southern community regarded the result with apprehension. It was a case in which a conflict of interests was inevitable. Nehemiah, convinced of the absolute need for utter exclusiveness if the Jews were to maintain the purity of their religion, saw that this implied a self-contained city, and he was not mistaken. The Samaritans, on the other hand, held a less exclusive

[1] *Com. Ezra–Nehemiah*, p. 27.

[2] Cf. *J. R. L., after Exile*, p. 26 ff.

conception of their religion, and felt no sympathy either with Nehemiah's aim or his way of attaining it. It impinged on their privileges, and they defended these as long and as well as they could. As we know, they lost the battle; but, though the political issue was settled, a religious controversy was provoked which brought about a disastrous schism, as we shall see in the next section.

Chapter V

HISTORY (*continued*)

Section III. Religious Feud and Final Separation from the Jews

Before plunging into the subject matter of the present chapter let us recall up the position reached. The Temple had been built at Jerusalem, but we have not been able to discover any opposition on the part of the Samaritans, though that is the usual opinion. The city walls have also been rebuilt, after one or more unsuccessful attempts. In this effort the Jews encountered the keenest opposition from all their neighbours, including the Samaritans, who were their chief antagonists. But we have, so far, no ground for the idea that this opposition was of a religious character. Further, up to the time of the wall-building, relations between Jews and Samaritans continued free and accommodating. The two peoples somehow managed to live on quite friendly terms with each other, relationships of a family nature, even intermarriage, were uninterrupted, correspondence took place between their leading men, and this despite the strain imposed by the frustration of the earlier attempts to rebuild the walls.

In the present chapter, however, we enter a different atmosphere. The conflict now assumes a different character. Nehemiah's second visit led to drastic measures being taken to prevent the recurrence of those inter-marriages which had become so common a feature in the past. If for no other reason than the slur which this prohibition cast upon those who had already contracted such alliances, it was not well received by many of the Jews themselves, and these not the least important. But to Samaritans it was peculiarly distasteful, both because it was an attack on their friendly relations with the Jews, and on religious grounds. And when

Nehemiah went so far as to turn out Tobiah from the Temple so unceremoniously, despite the high-priest's permission to have his room there, the sense of affront must have been felt very keenly.

Then at a later time (as we shall see) Ezra arrived, and the seed of final cleavage was sown. The issue was a complete schism between the two parties, which led to the building of the Samaritan Temple on Mount Gerizim, and an age-long bitterness which increased rather than diminished as the years passed. This bitter feud and schism is what we have now to trace.

I. Traces of the Conflict in Prophetic Literature

It would certainly be surprising if this conflict found no echo in the prophets of the time, even though their main concern lay in other directions.

1. *Book of Malachi.* There are two or three allusions in this small volume which call for examination. Its date is, approximately, just before Nehemiah's first visit to Jerusalem.

> Mal. i. 11: 'For from the rising of the sun . . . My name is great among the Gentiles; and in every place incense is offered unto My name and a pure offering, for My name is great among the Gentiles, saith Jahveh of hosts.'
>
> Mal. i. 14: '. . . My name is great among the Gentiles.'

Who are the Gentiles among whom Jahveh's name is great, who offer incense unto His name and a pure offering? Exegetes find it difficult to agree on any satisfactory answer. Some would have it that the nations generally were now convinced, according to the prophet, of the superiority of Jehovah over other gods; others that he refers to some groups among the heathen who had turned from their idols to Jehovah as the true god. But neither suggestion is probable. Driver[1] and J. M. P. Smith[2] regard the allusion as referring to the Jews of the dispersion, though in this case the incense would need to be treated as spiritually offered. Smith adds, that if one may judge from the Elephantiné Papyri, such offering was not frowned upon in the case of the Jews abroad.

[1] *Com. Malachi*, ad loc. (*Cent. Bib.*).

[2] *Com. Malachi*, *I. C. C.*, p. 32.

This may be the true reference, yet one wonders whether the reference may not be to the much nearer Samaritan community. They would be regarded by Malachi as Gentiles if, as appears to be the case, he belonged to the stricter section of the Jews. They undoubtedly did offer sacrifices, as we know from the testimony of the Trito-Isaiah, and, most important of all, never ceased to claim that all their worship was directed to Jehovah.

Only prejudice, therefore, could have induced Malachi to ignore them, and we have no sufficient reason for assuming this.

> Mal. ii. 10 ff.: '. . . Judah hath dealt treacherously and an abomination is committed in Israel and Jerusalem; for Judah hath . . . married the daughter of a strange god.'

Under other conditions we might perhaps take this as merely a symbolical denunciation of the mixture of idol-worship with the pure worship of Jehovah. But knowing the controversy of the time it seems more reasonable to treat it as a protest against marriage with 'strange,' possibly Samaritan, women. Here the prophet is only anticipating Nehemiah and Ezra.[1]

2. *Trito-Isaiah* (*Chaps. lvi.–lxvi.*). There is no general agreement as to the exact date to which this section of 'Isaiah' should be assigned, or whether indeed it does not belong to different dates. But there can be little doubt that it belongs to a time, or times, subsequent to Nehemiah. It is commonly admitted that some of its passages bear on the controversy before us. These are here classified for convenience:

(*a*) Passages in which the writer shows friendliness toward outsiders, e.g.:

> Isa. lvi. 3, 6 f.: 'Neither let the stranger that hath joined himself to Jahveh speak saying, Jahveh will surely separate me from His people. . . . Also the strangers . . . even them will I bring to My holy mountain, and make them joyful in My house of prayer; their burnt-offerings and their sacrifices shall be accepted upon Mine altar: for Mine house shall be called an house of prayer for all people.'

[1] Cf. Ezra ix. 2 ff., x. 18 f.; Neh. x. 30, xiii. 23 ff.

The broad liberality of this declaration is unmistakable. And if, as Whitehouse and others prefer to suppose, the primary reference is to proselytes and eunuchs of Israelite descent recently come to Judea from foreign courts, one can hardly be mistaken in discerning also an olive branch held out to the Northerners, who so greatly desired recognition.

(*b*) Next we pass to passages which are supposed to reveal an attempt to convert renegade Jews and Samaritans from the error of their ways. The evidence, however, is somewhat scanty, e.g. :

Isa. lvii. 19 : ' I create the fruit of thy lips : Peace, peace to him that is far off and to him that is near, saith Jahveh ; and I will heal him.'

Isa. lxv. 1 f. : ' I am inquired of by them that asked not for Me ; I am found of them that sought Me not : I said, Behold Me, behold Me, unto a nation that was not called by My name. I have spread out My hands all the day unto a rebellious people,' &c.

Whitehouse and Skinner hold that the reference in the former passage is to Jews only, in Palestine and the Diaspora. This is by no means certain, but it may pass. In the second passage, however, both are agreed that the reference is to the Samaritans. Thus to quote Skinner : ' The schismatics referred to are the half-caste Samaritans and their adherents among the ' people of the land," while the servants of Jehovah are the Jews and strictly legal party,' &c.[1] Cheyne agrees with this.[2] It would appear that some attempt had been made at the conversion of the Samaritans, but how far it had gone, and whether any concessions were proposed, remains doubtful.

(*c*) The more usual attitude to the Samaritans was one of scathing criticism, and there are several sections where this may be seen, e.g. lvii. 3–13 ; lxv. 3–5, 11 ; lxvi. 3 f. They are too lengthy to quote, but their general tenor is one of extreme severity. No doubt the writer had in mind not only the Samaritans and their evil practices, but also degenerate Jews and possibly heathen tribes in the neighbourhood. In regard to the Samaritans, however true these criticisms may have been of some, as also of some Jews, one can hardly bring oneself to believe that they were true of the community as a whole.

[1] *Com. Isaiah*, ii. 209 (*C. B. S. C.*). [2] *J. R. L. E.*, p. 27.

Remembering their protestation of devotion to Jehovah when they requested permission to assist in the building of the Temple,[1] and their later choice of the strict Jewish Pentateuch for their Law-book, it would seem more likely that the prophet's observations were true of a minority only. Again, the depreciation of 'Temple' and 'sacrifices' in chapter lxvi. is of so general a character as to be as applicable to Jerusalem as to the North. To assume, therefore, that these passages are intended as a description of the Samaritan community as a whole, or of it alone, would be as unfair as untrue.

(*d*) We must next consider a very remarkable section which is a standing difficulty to exegetes, viz. lxiii. 7–lxiv. 12. It may be well to place before the reader some of its outstanding portions:

Isa. lxiii. 16: 'For Thou art our father, for (R.V. translates 'though,' but without warrant) Abraham knoweth us not, and Israel doth not acknowledge us.'

Isa. lxiii. 17: 'O Lord, why dost Thou make us to err from Thy ways and hardenest our heart from Thy fear? Return for Thy servants' sake, the tribes of Thine inheritance.'

Isa. lxiii. 18 f.: 'Thy holy people possessed (it) but a little while: our adversaries have trodden down Thy sanctuary. We are become as they over whom Thou never bearest rule; as they that were not called by Thy name.'

Isa. lxiv. 10: 'Thy holy cities are become a wilderness, Zion is become a wilderness, Jerusalem a desolation.'

Let us first note the difficulties here.

In lxiii. 16 we are told that Abraham and Israel have ceased to recognize those whom the speakers represent. When did this occur, and to what section of the people can it refer? Abraham and Israel were long since dead, and therefore the reference could not be to them personally. One ought therefore to look in the direction of their representatives at the time. Cheyne resorts to the supposition that Abraham and Israel are here treated as demi-gods who had neglected their degenerate successors,[2] but this is too far-fetched to be probable.

In lxiii. 17 the speaker attaches blame to Jehovah for the peoples' wanderings from His ways and their consequent

[1] Ezra iv. 2.

[2] *Com. Isaiah*, ii. 108 f.

hardening of heart. And this, as Cheyne observes, is ' in spite of the encouraging invitations contained in this very book.'[1] One feels that there must be some particular circumstance in the speaker's mind.

lxiii. 18 tells us that the holy people had possessed the Temple ' but a little while.' This is the stock difficulty of the whole section, and some writers in their eagerness to escape from it have accepted an emendation of the text by Marti, though it depends upon an entirely unbiblical use of an important word.[2] The verse following, with its reference to the peoples' present condition, is, as Cheyne says, of very uncertain meaning. What were the circumstances in the speaker's mind?

In lxiv. 10 one notes the use of the plural ' holy cities.' When was there more than one holy city in the land? Elsewhere Jerusalem is ' the holy city.' The Septuagint and Vulgate translators have cut the knot by translating ' Thy holy city,' but without justification.

Various attempts have been made to explain this passage. Gressmann and Littmann assign the whole section to an earlier period, viz. 538–520 B.C., that is, the time when bitterness and disappointment prevailed, and no real beginning could be made to rebuild either Temple or wall. This, of course, would remove it from the Trito-Isaiah altogether; the Temple desolation referred to is that resulting from the events of 586 B.C. But what of lxiii. 18? Presumably Marti's emendation of the text would avail here, but that would not satisfy the allusion to holy ' cities ' or the rejection by Abraham and Israel. Whitehouse[3] favours this explanation.

Sellin places the devastation of the Temple between 515 and 500 B.C., but there is no sufficient reason for this, nor, even if true, would it help us out of the other difficulties.

Duhm gives 460–445 B.C. as the period meant, and makes the Samaritans the destroyers of the Temple. But neither at this time nor later have we any evidence of any such act on their part.

Cheyne comes down to the reign of Artaxerxes Ochus.[4] Josephus[5] mentions a pollution of the Temple by Bagoses, a

[1] *Com. Isaiah*, ii. 109.

[2] Marti changes למצער ישו עם־קדשך into צערו רשעים קדשך (Pi) למה (Why have wicked men despised thy Holy Place?) He is followed by Duhm, Skinner, and Whitehouse (*Coms.*, ad loc.).

[3] *Com. Isaiah* (*C. B.*), ii. 307. [4] 359–338 B.C. [5] *Ant.*, xi. vii. 1.

general of a later Artaxerxes, and this is so far looking in the same direction. It also makes unnecessary the questionable policy of reading the history backwards and so interfering with the arrangement of the Compiler. G. A. Smith not only mentions this incident *re* Bagoses, but alludes to another destruction of the Temple in 320 B.C., at the hands of Ptolemy Soter and referred to by Appian.[1] Marti makes the section still later, bringing it down to the time of the Maccabees. But if we can find an adequate explanation in the foregoing, it would be a mistake to suppose a date still later.

Recently a bold and promising suggestion has been made by L. E. Browne in his *Early Judaism*. He attributes the whole not to a Jewish prophet at all, but to a Samaritan. At first sight the idea seems incredible, but on closer examination there appears much in its favour. Those for whom the writer speaks claim Jehovah as their father at the time that Abraham and Israel have cast them off. Their non-recognition by the latter has led them into error; they have become unclean 'as they over whom Thou never bearest rule; as they that were not called by Thy name.' All this fits the Samaritan case excellently well. And if we assume, as Cheyne does, that the complaint belongs to some time after the erection of the Temple at Gerizim we have at once the explanation of the term 'holy cities,' for they were then two according to the Samaritan view. The devastation would be that to which Josephus refers at the hands of Bagoses.

Of course, this would involve the fragmentary character of Trito-Isaiah, but it only makes some sections a little later than they are already admitted to be, and many writers are willing to concede this on other grounds. The chief obstacle is, of course, that it implies the inclusion of a Samaritan passage by a Jewish writer, but the Samaritan element is not at all obtrusive and it might pass as Jewish without remark. If Browne's suggestion be true, and it certainly has the merit of meeting the difficulties better than any other, it throws a pathetic light on the sadness of the religious separation, and from an unusual standpoint—the Samaritan. And it could only be unreasonable prejudice which assumed that all the regrets were on one side.

(*e*) In two other passages, viz. lxv. 11, and lxvi. 1 f., there are believed to be allusions to the actual building of the Temple

[1] *E. B.*, col. 2426, art. 'Jerusalem.'

at Gerizim. The former runs: 'Ye that forsake Jahveh, that forget my holy mountain,' &c. Not all writers agree that this does refer to the Samaritans. But if the allusion be allowed, it ought to be remembered, in fairness to them, that however true it may have been that they had now forsaken the holy mountain of Jerusalem, it was emphatically not the case at an earlier time. It was Jewish exclusiveness which caused it.

To whomsoever the second passage refers it certainly does deprecate the building of a Temple. But which? The terms are so general that they are equally applicable to the orthodox Temple at Jerusalem, and the schismatic Temple at Gerizim. Likewise all sacrifices, by whomsoever offered, seem equally unwanted.

What light, then, does this section throw on the attitude of Samaritans and Jews toward each other and Jehovah at this time? Despite the uncertainty referred to, the following conclusions seem to be justified.

The writer (or writers) deprecates most strongly the aberrations from the pure worship of Jehovah, of which he gives some examples. When examined, the practices mentioned are seen to be too gross to have attracted any genuine worshipper of Jehovah. They are pure paganism, and can only have been practised by those who had abandoned that worship, if indeed they had ever been devoted to it.

It seems more than likely that the culprits were quite as often degenerate Jews as hybrid Samaritans. Both were exposed to similar temptations, and the Prophet was probably more disposed to be severe on Jews than Samaritans. For the former were still believed by their compatriots to be bound to Jehovah, whereas the latter were regarded by many as already beyond hope, and their conduct, therefore, almost beneath notice.

If the supposition be well founded that section (*d*) actually comes from a writer of Samaritan origin and has been incorporated by the Jewish Compiler, there is nothing very unfitting about this, as he places such small store by temples and sacrifices in general. The writer who could pen lxvi. 2 might well take it to heart that so many would-be worshippers of Jehovah in the North should be excluded from recognition by the strictness of men like Nehemiah. And though perhaps agreeing that it was inevitable, he might, nevertheless, regard the excluded ones with peculiar sympathy.

The assumption that the Prophet's criticisms of degenerate worshippers apply to the Samaritan community as a whole goes too far. Either now or a hundred years later, when presumably such degeneracy would have grown worse, these Samaritans built a Temple with aims and purposes similar to those at Jerusalem and took over the Jewish Pentateuch as their guide. Nor does either become a dead letter. If it is contended that the Samaritan community was saved by the Jews who joined them at this period, one feels the inadequacy of the explanation, for by hypothesis these Jews were also degenerate, or inclined to become so, or why did they forsake the stricter worship at Jerusalem for the alleged looseness in Samaria? How could such men save their new associates from further degeneracy?

3. *Ruth.*—This little volume is usually regarded as merely a beautiful idyll belonging to no particular time, and having no polemic associations. But there is good reason to suppose that it is more than this. It is probably of much later date than the period to which he refers. Its late position in the Jewish Canon, the Aramaisms found here and there, and the writer's treatment of the customs mentioned in chapter iv. as obsolete, are important factors in this conclusion. One is reluctant, of course, to bring so charming a story into the troubled waters of controversy, but, if this is nevertheless its true historic position, it goes far to reveal the tenacity of the opposition to the reforms introduced by Nehemiah and Ezra. For in tracing David's descent back to Ruth the Moabitess the writer adduces convincing evidence that intermarriage need be no barrier to the purity of faith. Confessedly it is somewhat surprising that such a damaging document should have been permitted to survive, and even become canonized, at a time when its teaching had come to be regarded as rank heresy, and in this respect it takes its place alongside Isaiah lxiii. 7–lxiv. 12, alluded to above.

II. Divisive Elements at Work

These were neither originally caused nor maintained by the building of the new Temple at Jerusalem. Doubtless the curt refusal to allow the Samaritans to share in any way in the new venture provoked deep resentment. But those responsible were probably the recent arrivals from Babylonia, with their stricter notions, and the old inhabitants merely acquiesced or

felt it discreet not to interfere. The ancient association between the two peoples continued, and is witnessed to by our Ezra–Nehemiah document.

The building of the wall was, of course, a much greater provocation. But even now no question of religion was involved. The Samaritans felt themselves deeply affected on the political side, and, as the undertaking was accompanied by the distinct refusal to continue the old association, it synchronized with the beginning of the real estrangement. But even so the difficulty might have been surmounted had it not been for Nehemiah's second visit, with its violent protest against mixed marriages, and summary exclusion of Tobiah from the Temple precincts. It is certainly not without significance that up till then Tobiah had maintained good relations with Eliashib and the nobles at Jerusalem.

The dangerous seductiveness of their pagan surroundings doubtless affected the *morale* of both Jews and Samaritans, and hastened the decisive action of the stricter Jews. The sight of so many abandoned to the practices of heathenism would show the need for prompt and complete severance, in order to save the remnant before it was too late. But if pity was mingled with their anger toward their own people, it was anger without pity for the Samaritans.

Whether right or wrong, it was unquestionably the action of Nehemiah which was the occasion of the final cleavage. This may have been inevitable, but it is indubitable. Nehemiah's date needs no discussion, as his first visit is generally admitted to have been in 445 B.C. and his second in 432 B.C. The matter of mixed marriages apparently did not arise on the first visit. He could hardly escape noticing the existence of the practice, but either his plans for dealing with it were not complete, or he found his hands already too full with the rebuilding of the wall. But on the second visit his action was both strong and drastic:

> And I contended with them and cursed them, and smote certain of them and plucked off their hair and made them swear by God, saying, Ye shall not give your daughters unto their sons, nor take their daughters for your sons or for yourselves.[1]

[1] Neh. xiii. 25.

That this demand caused grievous discontent and alarm may be surmised. Probably no other man could have made it with the least hope of success, and the marvel is that even Nehemiah, with all the prestige of his position, dared to enforce a command so unwelcome. No wonder that many Jews refused to obey and went over in a body to the Samaritans, from whom this demand was intended to estrange them. The Samaritans, on their part, felt themselves hit very hard: henceforth they were to be ranked with the heathen, and all intercourse was forbidden with their old Jewish friends. And, to complete the sense of grievance, they were no longer permitted to enter the Temple according to ancient custom. For, naturally, Tobiah's exclusion would not be a solitary incident, and if he were denied his room in the Temple, we may be sure that the ordinary man would also be forbidden its precincts.

This new and stricter attitude was legalized by the proclamation of the Law by Ezra. There could henceforth be no going back to the old and freer ways; the severance had become definite and stereotyped.

As will be noted, we have placed the activity of Ezra after that of Nehemiah, and must now say something in justification of this procedure. It ought to be said quite frankly at the outset there is no consensus of opinion on this point. Many, on the one side or the other, do indeed regard the question as settled or beyond dispute, one way or the other; but it is difficult, if not impossible, to feel confident, whatever conclusion one may reach. The question is too large and complicated for any exhaustive investigation here, but a brief statement may be offered.

The character of the Ezra–Nehemiah document has already been alluded to. Unfortunately its chronological arrangement presents great difficulties. For even when the history of Ezra is separated from that of Nehemiah, so that the story may run as smoothly as possible, we are still left in doubt as to the relations of the two men to each other. As already stated, Nehemiah was the wall-builder, the reformer of outstanding abuses, and the upholder of strict exclusiveness. His dates are 445 and 432 B.C. But when did Ezra come? His work as the Law-giver is clear enough, but immediately one seeks to know whether he anticipated or followed Nehemiah, we find ourselves without any certain answer.

It seems impossible to treat them as acting together in Jerusalem. The work of the one never seems to touch that of the other. There are, consequently, three possible times for Ezra's appearance: before Nehemiah, i.e. *circa* 458 B.C.; between Nehemiah's two visits, i.e. after 445 and before 432 B.C.; and after Nehemiah's second visit and departure—opinions differ as to the exact time.

1. The first date is that held by the Chronicler who edited the Ezra–Nehemiah document, and is the usual view. But the difficulties are manifold and apparently insuperable: e.g. Ezra's inexplicable silence during Nehemiah's heroic efforts to rebuild the wall; his entire disappearance from the history for so long at a time of such critical importance, notwithstanding his great enthusiasm; and, then, how are we to explain the amazing fact that after all Ezra's labours in proclaiming and enforcing the Law, Nehemiah found the condition of the people as bad as if he had never been?

2. Cheyne and Bertholet, with a few others, hold to the intermediate date. But it offers little relief from the difficulties just named. Nehemiah's perplexity *re* mixed marriages occurred during his second visit. How could this happen if Ezra had just proclaimed the new Law and obtained the people's solemn assent thereto? We are driven to regard his work as a complete failure, and in that case are still left with the problem of discovering by what means the Jews were finally induced to accept those strict principles of the Law which resulted in the Samaritan schism.

3. The third view is that Ezra's work ought to be placed some time after Nehemiah's final departure, perhaps as late as 397 B.C.

Some writers incline to the idea that in the passage Ezra vii. 8, where we are told that Ezra came in the 'seventh' year of King Artaxerxes, the word 'twenty' or 'thirty' has dropped out by accident, and if so this would bring his date down to 438 or 428 B.C. But if he came in 438 it would place him between Nehemiah's two visits, and we have shown the difficulties in that supposition. The year 428 B.C. would be about four years after Nehemiah's final return to Babylon, and is therefore free from some difficulties. Kosters gives his support to this view.[1]

[1] *E. B.*, ii. 1474, *n*, and 1487.

Others, however, believe that Ezra's advent was in the reign of Artaxerxes II, not Artaxerxes I, as is usually supposed, and this would bring down the date to 397 B.C. Van Hoonacker, Guthe, Peters, Batten, and others are associated with this theory. Lagrange, it may be remarked, differs from this by about a dozen years (385 B.C.). The evidence relied on for so late a date as the early part of the fourth century is not inconsiderable, if not absolutely convincing. In his well-known prayer Ezra expresses thanks for the mercy of God in enabling them 'to set up the house of our God . . . and to give us a wall in Judah and Jerusalem.'[1] What wall could this be but that built by Nehemiah in 445 B.C.? Again, we are told of Ezra going into the chamber of Jehohanan, the son of Eliashib. A comparison of passages[2] seems to show that Jehohanan was Eliashib's grandson, not his son, and so would belong to the later date of Ezra, now under consideration. The Elephantiné Papyri (Document I) mentions a Jehohanan who was high-priest about the time 407 B.C. and thus confirms this. Then it will be noticed that Ezra's Law is more thorough-going and far-reaching than Nehemiah's reforms. The latter only went so far as to forbid intermarriage, but Ezra demanded the immediate divorce of all foreign wives.[3] It seems not unreasonable to suppose that the milder action preceded the severer, and that had Nehemiah followed Ezra he would have grounded his denunciation on the Law recently received. It is quite in keeping with this, that in a passage in Nehemiah we have a statement involving three men placed in this order: Joiakim, the son of Joshua, Nehemiah, and Ezra,[4] thus suggesting the priority of Nehemiah to Ezra.

The argument does not lead us into the realm of certainty, but the balance of probability, as it appears to the present writer, inclines strongly to a later date for Ezra. This at any rate makes the development of events more comprehensible. First, the man of action arrives, and on his first visit wisely restricts himself to the practical and acceptable task of erecting the wall. Later, maddened by the religiously destructive effects of mixed marriages, he proceeds in a rough and ready fashion to denounce the practice and demand its abandonment. But Nehemiah's success, perhaps because not

[1] Ezra ix. 9.
[2] Cf. Ezra x. 6, with Neh. xii. 11, 22.
[3] Cf. Ezra. x. 11 f., with Neh. xiii. 25.
[4] Neh. xii. 26.

based on law, was only partial and temporary. Then came Ezra, who witnessed to his horror the people's relapse into their ancient weakness. The time had manifestly arrived for the proclamation of the Law newly brought from Babylon, to which the people must be induced to pledge themselves. The proclamation is made and instruction follows.

We are guided to the more exact definition of the date of Ezra by the fact that the abuse of the mixed marriages had again become rampant after Nehemiah's attack upon it, and this points to some considerable lapse of time which such a date as 397 B.C. would allow for. If it be replied that this circumstance would fit in equally well with the reversal of the names of the leaders, it may be pointed out again, that in that case it is passing strange that Nehemiah neglected to use so strong an argument as that the people were flagrantly disobeying a law which they had recently pledged themselves to observe.

One further fact needs to be emphasized, viz. that the Jewish opposition to this reform was considerable. One outstanding case, which will come up for consideration presently, is mentioned in Nehemiah. The grandson of Eliashib, the high-priest, had married the daughter of Sanballat, the Horonite, and, says Nehemiah: 'I chased him from me.'[1] The hospitality of the high-priest to Tobiah is only another instance of the antagonism to the exclusive spirit of Nehemiah. Nehemiah's ultimate non-success, which distressed Ezra so greatly, is peculiarly striking in view of the immense services he had rendered to the community as a whole. It needed all the resolution of Ezra, and the solemnity of the Great Assembly, to stamp out what seemed an inherent disposition on the part of the people. But Ezra won the day, and intercourse with the Samaritans was ever afterwards recognized as a forbidden thing, and excluding from the fellowship of the people of Jehovah.

III. Final Severance between Jews and Samaritans: the Temple at Gerizim

This was obviously the only possible sequel to the bitter feud. Each side had burnt its boats, and it was impossible to go back. Unhappily, however, there is no general agreement

[1] Neh. xiii. 28.

on the exact course of events. Two points may be regarded as beyond question, viz. first, that the actions of Nehemiah and Ezra together made reconciliation between the two parties impossible; and secondly, that by the time of Alexander the Great, i.e. about 330 B.C., if not before, a Samaritan Temple had been built on Mount Gerizim as a rival to that at Jerusalem. The separation had by that time become final and extremely bitter. There are two historical references to this last event, viz. in Nehemiah and Josephus.

Nehemiah's reference is very brief:[1]

> And one of the sons of Joiada, the son of Eliashib, the high-priest, was son-in-law to Sanballat, the Horonite: therefore I chased him from me. Remember them, O my God, because they have defiled the priesthood, and the covenant of the priesthood, and of the Levites.

The account of Josephus[2] is much fuller and more detailed:

> Now when John (Johanan) departed this life his son Jaddus (Jaddua) succeeded him in the high-priesthood. He had a brother whose name was Manasseh. Now there was one Sanballat, who was sent into Samaria by Darius, the last King of Persia. He was a Cuthaean by race, of the same stock as the Samaritans. This man knew that the city of Jerusalem was a famous city, and that their kings had given a great deal of trouble to the Assyrians and to the people of Coele-Syria, so he willingly gave his daughter, whose name was Nicaso, in marriage to Manasseh, thinking this alliance by marriage would be a pledge and security that the nation of the Jews would continue their good-will to him.
>
> . . . . . .
>
> Now the elders of Jerusalem, being very indignant that the brother of Jaddus, the high-priest, as he was married to a foreigner, should be a partner with him in the high-priesthood, formed a party against him.
>
> . . . . . .
>
> So they commanded Manasseh to divorce his wife, or not to approach the altar.
>
> . . . . . .
>
> Whereupon Manasseh went to his father-in-law, Sanballat.
>
> . . . . . .

[1] Neh. xiii. 28 f.

[2] *Ant.*, XI. vii. 2, and viii. 2–7.

'Then Sanballat promised not only to preserve to him his priesthood, but to procure for him the power and dignity of high-priest, and to make him governor of all the places he himself now ruled over, if he would retain his daughter as his wife. He also said further, that he would build a Temple like that at Jerusalem upon Mount Gerizim, which is the highest of all the mountains in Samaria, and he promised that he would do this with the approbation of Darius, the King. Manasseh was elated by these promises, and stayed with Sanballat, supposing that he should get the high-priesthood from Darius, for it happened that Sanballat was already in years. But there was now a great disturbance among the people of Jerusalem, because many of the priests and Levites were entangled in such marriages. For they all revolted to Manasseh, and Sanballat afforded them money, and divided among them land for tillage, and gave them habitations also, in order in every way to gratify his son-in-law.

. . . . . .

He (Sanballat) told him (Alexander) that he had a son-in-law, Manasseh, who was brother to the high-priest Jaddus, and that there were many others of his own nation now with him that were desirous to have a Temple in the region that was under him; and that it would be for the King's advantage to have the strength of the Jews divided into two, lest, if the nation was of one mind and united, upon any revolutionary attempt it should prove troublesome to him, as it had formerly proved to the kings of Assyria. Thereupon Alexander gave Sanballat leave to do so, and he used the utmost diligence, and built the Temple, and made Manasseh the priest, and deemed it a very great honour that his daughter's children should have that dignity.

Let us examine these two statements with some care. They have marked differences.

Nehemiah's Account.

This is extremely brief, omitting even the name of the culprit. No direct mention is made of the effects of the expulsion upon the people themselves. One sentence leaves the reader in some doubt as to the writer's meaning, when

Nehemiah prays: 'Remember *them*, O my God.'[1] Only one person, the grandson of the high-priest, has been referred to up to this point, yet we have the plural of the pronoun. It gives the reader the impression that what we possess is not a complete report of the words of Nehemiah, but rather a summary from a later hand, perhaps that of the Chronicler himself. Again, no schism is suggested, though there must have been many sympathizers with the leading defaulter.[2] Torrey, though admittedly an advanced critic, is not without warrant in denying that this chapter is really from the hand of Nehemiah.[3] He suggests that the Chronicler has attempted in this passage to show how Nehemiah in his day dealt with a case like Manasseh's which had happened in his own time. Further, if Nehemiah had actually been associated so intimately with the great Samaritan schism the Chronicler could never have omitted mention of it from the memoirs of that distinguished man, and it is probable that the high-priest's name would also have been given. The Chronicler's antagonism to the North, even before it was called Samaritan, is well known. For instance, his treatment of the history of Rehoboam and his successors is more favourable than that of the editor of the Book of Kings.[4] And even at that early stage he was disposed to deny the Northerners the right to be considered the people of Jehovah.[5]

The Account of Josephus.

Josephus offers a carefully prepared and detailed statement of the whole episode. He gives us the name of the culprit as well as that of his wife. He likewise mentions the exact period when the incident occurred, viz. in the reign of Darius, the last King of Persia, who had made Sanballat satrap, i.e. after 335 B.C.; the mention of Alexander's advent gives us another precise date, 330 B.C. Such precision would seem to show that Josephus is quite clear about the date in his own mind.

Sanballat's reason for agreeing to the marriage, the power and importance of Jerusalem, would have been absurd in

[1] זכרה להם [2] Cf. Neh. xiii. 23 ff.
[3] *Vide Compos, &c. of Ezra–Nehemiah*, p. 48 f.; also *E. R. E.*, art. 'Sams.,' 163, *n.*
[4] Cf. 1 Kings xii. 21–24 with 2 Chron. xi.; also 1 Kings xv. 3 f. with 2 Chron. xiii. 4–12.
[5] 2 Chron. xiii. 9, xxv. 7.

Nehemiah's time, for in those days Jerusalem contained a very feeble folk, more calculated to provoke contempt than fear.

The anxiety of the Jerusalem Elders at Manasseh's action seems to belong to a time when the early rush of deserters, due to Ezra's legislation, had gone by. They were now afraid that it might begin afresh. Apparently even priests and Levites had become entangled in similar marriages, though shielded hitherto by their lower status.

Josephus is certainly not inspired by good-will toward the Samaritans. In fact, he rarely finds a good word to say in their favour. If, therefore, in this record he tells us how nearly legitimate, according to Jewish standards, their high-priestly line was, it can only be because he regarded it as a well-founded tradition. His whole story has little resemblance to the meagre record in Nehemiah, and must be regarded as entirely independent.

How are we to Reconcile these Two Accounts ?

1. The usual assumption is that they refer to the same event, with the correction that Josephus places the incident a century later than Nehemiah, and is to that extent mistaken.

To refer to the most recent writers only, Montgomery accounts for Josephus's error on two grounds : first, it is an example of the customary Jewish chronological inaccuracy when treating of Persian history ; apparently the Chronicler is to be regarded as an exception to this rule, or perhaps the tendency did not show itself till later. Secondly, he points to the Jewish disposition to bring everything possible into what is called the Alexander legend.[1] Cheyne is of a similar opinion : 'The chronology of the Persian period was, in Josephus's time, so obscure that he may well be pardoned for such an error.'[2] But as Josephus would have by him the accepted and canonized Ezra–Nehemiah document, it is certainly remarkable that he deliberately contradicted it, unless indeed he regarded his own story as quite different from that incident.

2. But several modern writers take other views. A. E. Cowley, after making all allowance for Josephus's frequent inaccuracy, is disposed to accept both stories : 'We may, therefore, put the secession of Manasseh soon after 432, and perhaps accept Josephus's account that the Temple was built

[1] *Samaritans*, p. 68 f. [2] *J.R.L.E.*, p. 31.

about 332.'[1] J. P. Peters is of the same opinion: 'Putting together what we learn from Nehemiah, the Elephantiné Papyri, and Josephus, it would seem that the schism began with the exclusion of Manasseh by Nehemiah, about 430 B.C., and the erection of a Samaritan shrine on Gerizim, which . . . the Samaritans ultimately claimed to be the one and only Temple ordered in the Law. This latter stage, however, was not reached until a century later, at the commencement of the Greek period.'[2] J. Skinner follows a similar line: 'Whatever may have taken place under Nehemiah, the names of Darius and Alexander are too closely and explicitly associated by Josephus with the building of the Temple to be set aside as unchronological. While there may have been some confusion in the mind of that writer with events of Nehemiah's time, we have no right to transfer his narrative bodily to a date of 100 years earlier; and it is reasonable to allow that he was probably well informed in assigning the building of the Samaritan Temple to the early reign of Alexander. If so, we must infer that the final constitution of the Samaritan community on a religious basis, with priesthood and ritual, belongs to that time.'[3] Canon Box also accepts a late date, and to his arguments we shall refer presently.

In endeavouring to reach a satisfactory conclusion in the midst of such diversity of opinion, one is confronted at once by the uncertainty of the data. If Josephus is unsafe, Nehemiah is meagre. The unusual obscurity of the period is freely admitted by all, and perhaps no conclusion can be entirely satisfactory. But one ought surely to beware of a too easy deliverance from the difficulties. To conclude, with the majority of writers, that the two stories are fundamentally one, but that Josephus is wrong as usual in his date, strikes one as being too simple a way of settling the question. As already noted, if Josephus was wrong he was so deliberately, for Ezra–Nehemiah was in his hands. He seems to be correcting what he considered an error.

Many writers agree that Ezra followed Nehemiah, after a shorter or longer interval. But curiously enough they fail to see the significance of this view on the date of the schism. And this is still more remarkable when one notes its bearing

[1] *E.B.*, iv. 4260.
[2] *Relig. of the Hebrews*, 360, *n.*
[3] *Divine Names in Genesis*, p. 119 f.

on the date of the completed Pentateuch, and consequently on the time when it must have been received by the Samaritans as their authoritative Law, which as all agree could only have taken place before the final schism.

Let us begin at this agreed point. The crucial stage of the dispute was not reached until the Law was announced and expounded by Ezra, i.e. about the beginning of the fourth century. We may then assume that the more friendly of the Samaritans would wait a little before taking any action which might prove irrevocable, in the hope that the new Law would prove less rigid in practice than it was in theory. They had witnessed the failure of Nehemiah's violent methods, and perhaps Ezra's would prove similarly ineffective. As we know, their hopes were vain ; the Law remained, and the people in general obeyed it. In the long run, too, the Samaritans themselves adopted the newly reconstructed Pentateuch without material alterations, possibly hoping that this would help to appease the more exclusive Jews. Probably this act caused difficulty with the more liberal Samaritans, and further time must be allowed for this to have died down. For, obviously, had the final severance taken place soon after the adoption of the new Law, an attempt would have been made to substitute some earlier and less rigid version in lieu of the later and more ' exclusive ' edition. If, then, Ezra's activity was approximately 400 B.C.—and we must allow not less than, say, a couple of generations for these developments—the date of the schism could not be much earlier than that accepted by Josephus. To this argument Canon Box makes an important addition : ' By the time of the schism in 330, the text of the Pentateuch, in which the Jewish and Samaritan recensions agree, had developed certain textual corruptions which are common to both. That means that a common text must have been current in both communities for some considerable time. If we put the interval at fifty years approximately we shall not be far wrong, and that would yield us the date *circa* 380 as that of Ezra's promulgation of the Law in its approximately final official form. This result harmonizes with our general conclusion as to Ezra's date.' [1]

Karl Budde is in general agreement with this view : ' We may suppose that before the final separation of the Samaritans

[1] *M. S. Lectures.*

there elapsed an interval of some decades which would give ample time for the completion of the Law. . . . This explains why the book of Nehemiah closes with the expulsion of the son-in-law of Sanballat, but says nothing as to the setting up of the Temple and church of the Samaritans. There is no occasion for scepticism as to the entire story in Josephus.'[1] It is also significant that the Elephantiné Papyri, which belong to the end of the fifth century, give no indication of any such feud between Jews and Samaritans as the usual theory presumes to have existed at that time, and no mention is made of any religious head of the Samaritans who, according to that theory, had already been chosen.[2]

There remains the recurrence of the name of the Governor Sanballat, regarded by most as settling the identity of the two stories. But the difficulty is not so great as it seems. The Sanballat of the Nehemiah period was still alive when the Papyri were written, i.e. at the end of the fifth century, though he must have been an old man. His two sons, Delaiah and Shelemaiah, were evidently by that time also in power, probably assisting their father to administer the province in his old age. There is, therefore, nothing improbable in the supposition that the son of one of these younger men was called after the name of his grandfather, according to a common custom, and succeeded in his turn to the post of Governor, though at the time of Alexander he too would be an old man. This view is supported by Canon Box as well as Dr. Torrey, who concludes: 'It seems to me that the evidence before us is sufficient to show that this probability was actually realized. At the time when Alexander the Great arrived in Syria the Governor of Samaria was, in fact, Sanballat II.'[3]

On the whole, then, it seems not at all improbable that for once, at least, Josephus is right in his general statement. He had no inducement, that we can discern, for departing from Nehemiah's account unless he believed him mistaken or inadequate. Moreover, it is much more in accord with the facts actually known to us that the actions of Nehemiah and Ezra should take effect slowly, owing to the reluctance of many on both sides to sever old relationships. Nehemiah's account really tells us little or nothing of the final cleavage, and it is not

[1] *E. B.*, i. 659, and note.
[2] Cf. Warren J. Moulton, art. 'Sams.', *E. R. E.*, xi. 163.
[3] Op. cit. p. 330.

even certain that the record there given is from Nehemiah's hand. If, then, the breach widened slowly and gradually, as was natural, and if we are obliged to allow time for the completion of the Pentateuch and its willing acceptance by the Samaritans before a separate Temple could be thought of, we seem driven to agree with the chronology of Josephus.

The effect of the cleavage on the future development of the two sections of the people must have been considerable. Bertholet[1] holds that it had value for Judaism by removing from Jews the necessity of admitting outsiders to the enjoyment and privileges of the Jewish faith. The inner circle was thus kept free from dangerous admixture, and permitted to develop along its own proper line without syncretistic elements. Would-be proselytes could find their home further North. As for the Samaritans, Montgomery[2] believes that, though nominally separated from the Jews, they remained dependent upon them for religious development and inspiration. How far this is true will be better seen after their doctrines have been examined.

[1] *Stellung*, p. 176. [2] *Samaritans*, p. 72.

Chapter VI

HISTORY (*continued*)

Section IV. Greek, Egyptian, Syrian, and Maccabean Times

Though it is quite evident that this was a period of striking and critical events in the history of the Samaritans, it need not detain us very long, as our information is not only slight, but obviously onesided. Josephus is our chief and, in many cases, our only informant, and his bias against the Samaritans is manifest throughout. Where we are able to check his statements from other sources this becomes quite clear, and one is bound to surmise its presence elsewhere. It may be that what he narrates actually occurred, but his bias is seen in the turn he gives to the incidents, and his omission of provocative causes. To take but one instance of this attitude at the very outset of this period : he reports a conversation between Alexander and the Samaritans, much to the discredit of the latter, of which he could not possibly have possessed intimate knowledge.[1]

So far as the time of Alexander is concerned there is little that is certain or clear. We are told that the Samaritans offered him assistance against his Persian opponent, Darius, and that on account of this help, and by means of the astute intercession of Sanballat, permission was granted for the building of the Temple on Mount Gerizim. The Jews, for reasons of their own, adhered to Darius, and this political attitude brought them into disfavour with the conqueror, but they speedily sought and found a way out ; and finally they too obtained favours from Alexander.[2]

After Alexander's death, Jews and Samaritans alike suffered great hardship under his immediate and quarrelsome successors. Palestine became the cock-pit in which the Egyptian Ptolemies and the Syrian Seleucids fought for possession of power. In

[1] Cf. *Ant.*, xi. viii. 6.

[2] *Ant.*, xi. viii. 4 and 6.

320 B.C. Egypt took over Samaria; in 314 it reverted to the Syrian Antigonus; three years later Ptolemy reconquered it, and destroyed Samaria and other towns; some years afterwards he captured it again; and at last, in 298, after being ravaged by the Syrians, it fortunately passed into the peaceable control of Egypt for many years.

One would have supposed that common misfortune would have brought together Samaritans and Jews in sympathy for each other. But apparently it was not so, for Josephus remarks quite casually that under the Syrian Antiochus III,[1] who made friends with the Egyptian Ptolemy V, 'at this time the Samaritans were in a flourishing condition, and much harassed the Jews, ravaging their land and carrying off slaves.'[2] How much truth there is in this final allegation it is impossible to say.

From the beginning of the second century B.C. Palestine had the great misfortune to pass again out of the hands of Egypt into the control of Syria. At the outset, the new rulers appear to have followed the Persian example and made Samaria a centre of civil administration. Naturally this extended and intensified the process of Hellenization which had been in operation for over a century. For a long time Jerusalem and the South, sheltered by the inaccessibility of their hills, had suffered less from this movement, though they had not entirely escaped. But their time had come at last. The Samaritans, on the contrary, had all along been more exposed to Hellenistic influences on account of their geographical openness, and the diverse character of their population.

Antiochus Epiphanes

Under Antiochus Epiphanes[3] the Jews were subjected to deliberate persecution by this semi-insane monarch. Led on probably by Jews already inclined to Hellenism, of whom many occupied prominent places in the priesthood, he did his utmost to crush out utterly Jewish faith and life. To their everlasting honour they resisted, but Jerusalem was captured, the Temple pillaged, and the people themselves suffered the most horrible cruelties. The Samaritans appear to have been threatened with similar treatment, but, as already pointed out, circumstances made them more amenable to Greek influences.

[1] 223–187 B.C. [2] *Ant.*, XII. iv. 1. [3] 175–164 B.C.

Josephus adds that in their fear they had recourse to an unworthy attitude. According to him they wrote a letter to Epiphanes declaring that they were not really Jews at all, but Sidonians, and expressing their willingness to have their Temple on Mount Gerizim, which so far had never received a name, called 'the temple of Zeus Hellenius.' He even quotes this alleged letter in full, and one wonders whence he obtained it.[1] Happily for the reputation of the Samaritans the incident is also mentioned in 2 Maccabees. This is a book with Pharisaic leanings, and therefore not likely to favour Samaritans, and was written in all probability not later than 106 B.C., and so nearly two hundred years nearer the event than the *Works of Josephus*. This unknown author states quite briefly that: 'Shortly after this the king sent an old Athenian to compel the Jews to depart from the Laws of their fathers, and to cease living by the Laws of God; further, the sanctuary in Jerusalem was to be polluted and called after Zeus Olympius, while the sanctuary at Gerizim was also to be called after Zeus Xenius, in keeping with the hospitable character of the inhabitants. Now this proved a sore and altogether crushing visitation of evil.'[2] The account of Josephus cannot be pronounced impossible in view of the great increase of the foreign element in Samaria, but, if true, it would be a severe reflection on the devotion of those who had so often claimed to be worshippers of Jehovah. But there is much more probability in the plain record of 2 Maccabees, which represents the Samaritans as being in the same plight as the Jews, upon whom abomination was thrust by the Syrian tyrant. On several occasions Josephus charges the Samaritans with denying or claiming Jewish kinship according to the advantages or disadvantages of the relationship. Thus, 'when the Jews are in adversity they deny that they are akin to them, confessing then the truth; but when they perceive that some good fortune has befallen them, they immediately pretend to be related to them, saying that they belong to them, and trace their genealogy from the posterity of Joseph, Ephraim, and Manasseh.'[3] But, as Jackson and Lake remark, this is 'a statement which is hardly borne out by facts.'[4] So far as the present period is concerned, at any rate, it is much more probable that their comparative

[1] *Ant.*, XII. v. 5.
[2] *Ant.*, XI. viii. 6; cf. also IX. xiv. 3 and XII. v. 5.
[3] 2 Macc. vi. 1–3.
[4] *Beg. of Christianity*, i. 124.

immunity from Syrian interference was due to the absence of faction among them, in striking contrast with their neighbours the Jews, and that they did not intermeddle with political affairs. That the genuine Samaritans adhered throughout to their ancient faith may be concluded from the fierce hatred of John Hyrcanus toward them in 128 B.C., to which reference will be made presently.

The real feeling of Jews towards Samaritans in this century may be gauged from a couple of passages, the one written near the beginning, and the other near the end of it. *Sirach*[1] says :

> With two nations is my soul vexed,
> And the third is no nation :
> They that sit upon the mountain of Samaria (or Seir), and the Philistines,
> And that foolish people that dwelleth in Sichem.[2]

Again, in the *Testament of Levi*[3] we read :

> From this day forward shall Shechem be called the city of imbeciles ;
> For as a man mocketh a fool so do we mock them.[4]

Such being their feelings, only opportunity was wanted to translate them into deeds. This came in the reign of *John Hyrcanus*.[5] The Syrians were then in retreat, and Hyrcanus was intent on taking full advantage of the Jews' change of fortune. Among his many exploits he took Shechem and Gerizim, ' whose Temple was now laid waste 200 years after it was built.' Encouraged by this success, he next laid siege to the city of Samaria, and after a whole year ' razed Samaria to the ground, and brought rivulets to it to swamp it, and by digging through it he made a lake of it, and took away all indications that there had ever been a city there at all.'[6] Josephus tells us of the desperate straits to which the people were reduced during this tragic experience, and also that Hyrcanus believed himself to be actuated by patriotism and religion. One notes with interest, too, the description of the

[1] 180-175 B.C. [2] *Ecclus.* l. 25 and 26. [3] *Circa* 109–107 B.C.
[4] *Test. Levi*, vii. 2. [5] 135–105 B.C. [6] *Ant.*, XIII. X. 3.

Temple which is said to have been 'built in imitation of the Temple at Jerusalem.' Its pagan associations had quickly disappeared, as soon as the Syrians released their grip, and the Samaritans were free to do with it what they would.[1] These incidents inevitably added to the bitterness felt towards the Jews, and the effect on Samaritan religion must have been considerable, since henceforth it became perforce a religion deprived of its natural climax, a Temple.

[1] *Ant.*, XIII. ix. 1, x. 1–3; *War*, I. ii. 6 f.

Chapter VII

HISTORY (*continued*)

Section V. Roman and Later Times

From now on the Samaritans were under the heel of the Jews, though, as has been suggested by the Samaritan historian Abu'l Fath, it is just possible that the ruling Hasmoneans modified their conduct somewhat when they forsook the Pharisees and allied themselves with the Sadducees, with whom the Samaritans had much in common. But this is little more than a surmise, and the coming of the Romans in 63 B.C. brought the oppressed party welcome relief. Pompey freed them at once from the Jewish yoke, and bestowed upon them many privileges, including a Senate of their own.[1] The Syrian governor, Gabinius,[2] rebuilt Samaria,[3] and later Herod the Great enlarged and beautified it, chose it as his residence, and made a Samaritan one of his wives. In honour of its new association with Rome Herod renamed the city Sebaste, and adorned it with a magnificent temple. 'For when he had built a most beautiful wall twenty furlongs long round a town in the district of Samaria, and had brought six thousand inhabitants into it, and had erected a very large temple to Augustus, and had laid round about it a sacred enclosure of three furlongs and a half, he called the city Sebaste.'[4] The Samaritans responded, as might be expected, to this better treatment, and when rebellious disturbances broke out among the Jews after Herod's death they kept aloof. As a reward for their loyalty the Roman authority remitted a quarter of their taxes.

Unhappily, the relations between the two peoples got worse rather than better through these changes of fortune, and down

[1] *Ant.*, XIV. iv. 4, XVIII. iv. 2; *War*, I. vii. 7.
[2] *Ant.*, XIV. v. 3; *War*, I. viii. 4.
[3] 57–55 B.C.
[4] *War*, I. xxi. 2; cf. *Ant.*, XV. viii. 5.

to the closing years of the Jewish state Jews and Samaritans maintained for each other an implacable hatred. At times it may have appeared to die down, but soon its presence was again revealed by acts of the utmost violence. Some instances of this may be mentioned.

Soon after the deposition of Archelaus,[1] the Samaritans, who apparently were at this time not prohibited from entering the Jewish Temple, on one occasion took advantage of this privilege by scattering secretly dead men's bones in its courts. The Jews, as is well known, entertained the strictest notions with regard both to the dead and to the sacredness of the Holy Place, and were horrified and angered at so gross an outrage. But they no longer possessed the power to revenge themselves as of old, and could only forbid the Samaritans any future participation in the Jewish feasts.[2]

A little later, while *Pilate* was Procurator,[3] the Samaritans, stirred apparently by the Messianic hopes of the time, were invited by one of their co-religionists to go to Mount Gerizim, where he would disclose to them the sacred vessels which the great law-giver Moses had hidden there. A large number went armed to the appointed place, a village named Tirathaba, whence they proposed to make the ascent of the holy mount. But Pilate, hearing of this intention, and apparently fearing a revolt, took a band of horsemen and seized the roads leading to the mountain. A struggle ensued, and large numbers of the Samaritans were slain. An appeal was made to Vitellius, the Syrian Governor, against the conduct of Pilate, and this resulted in his recall.[4]

Another equally sad story belongs to a somewhat later time.[5] On a certain occasion *Galilean pilgrims* were on their way south to Jerusalem, and, instead of taking the Eastern route, were making their way through the province of Samaria, when they were attacked by the Samaritans at Cinea. The consequences were disastrous, civil war ensued, and the Romans were obliged to intervene. The dispute was carried at length to the Emperor Claudius, and his verdict was against the Samaritans.[6]

When the *great war* broke out[7] between the Jews and the Romans, the Samaritans, infected with the mad patriotism

[1] A.D. 6. [2] *Ant.*, XVIII. ii. 2. [3] A.D. 26–36. [4] *Ant.*, XVIII. iv. 1 f.
[5] *Circa* A.D. 51. [6] *Ant.*, XX. vi. 1–3; *War*, II. xii. 3–7. [7] In A.D. 66.

of the Zealots, who were now roaming about the country inciting their countrymen to rise against Rome and promising deliverance from its yoke, made common cause with their former enemies. In the course of the struggle, the city of Samaria was burnt to the ground; large numbers of the people betook themselves to Mount Gerizim, determined to resist the Romans to the bitter end, where, according to Josephus, no fewer than 11,600 Samaritans were massacred by the Romans.[1]

The *later history* does not really fall within the scope of our purpose, but it is so slight that a few paragraphs may be added to complete it.

Though the Samaritans had joined forces with the Jews against Vespasian, when the rebellion of Bar Cochba broke out in the time of Hadrian,[2] they inconsistently took the side of the Romans. Again the Romans rewarded them for their help, this time giving them permission to rebuild their Temple on Mount Gerizim. A little later, however, when the Jews were finally dispersed, the Samaritans themselves suffered a similar fate, and are found later in Egypt, Rome, and elsewhere in the Roman Empire.

Towards the end of the second century[3] they lost the right of citizenship as a punishment for interference in the quarrels of the Empire. The miserable story has been well summed up by Montgomery[4]: 'Rival emperors, insurgent governors, the wars with Parthians and Sassanians, all heaped their evils upon the devoted land, while within its borders the general civic disorder gave scope, under the cover of repressive laws, to the exactions of wilful and covetous officials, who treated the Samaritan sect, so outlandish to pagan eyes, with even more despite than they did the rest of their unfortunate subjects. The community was more than decimated, its riches looted, its culture almost exterminated, as indeed the Samaritans record. . . . But the Samaritans possessed no like material and political advantages. Only the obstinacy of their religion saved them through these and the succeeding centuries of chaos, and in view of this persistence we dare not deny them credit for a true religious faith.'

It soon became clear that there was no future for the

[1] *War*, III. vii. 32.
[2] A.D. 194.
[3] A.D. 117–138.
[4] *Samaritans*, p. 98 f.

Samaritan race, and it cannot be denied that they were themselves largely to blame for this. To their ancient hatred of Jews they now added hatred of Christians. And at the close of the fifth century the Romans visited them with further punishment on this account, the Temple at Gerizim being again and finally destroyed. Only a few years afterwards,[1] Justinian found it necessary to impose upon them serious political and social disabilities. Of course, they were not without some justification for the spirit of hatred which animated them. Once the Christians found themselves in the ascendant, they too imbibed the persecuting spirit, and showed but scanty toleration for the insignificant community of the Samaritans. Had it not been for the nobler elements in their religion, which sustained them despite their own errors, and the intolerance of others, the Samaritans must have been utterly exterminated. Indeed, for many centuries after this all trace of them is lacking.

In the *Middle Ages*, however, they are to be found at Nablus (Shechem), Caesarea, Damascus, and Cairo. In the twelfth century[2] Benjamin of Tudela paid a visit to Palestine and met with certain remnants of the sect. He tells us of 100 at Shechem, where they possessed a Synagogue, though the Passover was celebrated with sacrifices at Gerizim; 200 were discovered also at Caesarea, 300 at Ascalon, and 400 at Damascus. Since that time many Western travellers have shown great interest in their existence and practices, among whom may be mentioned Joseph Scaliger,[3] Pietro della Valle,[4] and Bishop Huntingdon.[5] The result of this series of visits was that a considerable correspondence took place, and much valuable information was obtained.

Coming to *later times*, Heinrich Petermann, in 1853, spent two months with the community, attended their Passover celebration, and carefully investigated their claims. At that time there were only 122 Samaritans in Nablus. Many important MSS. have subsequently come to hand, the chief of which are stored in the British Museum. One of the latest visitors was E. Kautsch, who went out in 1904. He says that he could find no more than 175 of the old sect in Nablus, and none elsewhere, the remainder having apparently died off.

[1] A.D. 529. [2] A.D. 1163. [3] Sixteenth century.
[4] Seventeenth century. [5] Late seventeenth century.

The people of the sect now live in a special quarter of Nablus; they have an ecclesiastical head whose descent is traced to Uzziel, the younger son of Kohath,[1] son of Levi. But he is designated the Levite-priest, not the high-priest, as the last member of the high-priestly family, who could claim descent from the eldest son of Aaron, had died in the early part of the seventeenth century.

The probable future of the Samaritans is sufficiently indicated when it is pointed out that of the 152 who were found in 1901 there were 97 males and only 55 females; and that according to their own regulations they are not allowed to marry outside their own community.

[1] *Vide* Exod. vi. 18.

Chapter VIII

DOCTRINES AND INSTITUTIONS

I.—Doctrines

Unless our reconstruction of the earlier history of our sect is entirely erroneous, it will be evident that at the time when the two peoples began to draw apart their beliefs were essentially identical. To what extent the Assyrian immigrants influenced their practices for a time is a matter of dispute, partly because of the difficulty of discriminating between the practices of the immigrants and those of the original Samaritans. But no trace of Assyrian influence can be found in any existing statement of Samaritan beliefs, and none is discoverable in their institutions. 'The faith of the Samaritans was Jewish Monotheism, and there is nothing to indicate that it was influenced in any fundamental way by infusion from pagan religions.'[1] When the cleavage occurred, the only Canonical book acknowledged by the Jews was the Pentateuch. It was inevitable, therefore, that the Separatists should take this with them to regulate their religious life and the ritual of their new Temple. This is what actually happened, and to this day they have never allowed any other Code of Laws to usurp or even share its authority.

In due course the Jews evolved a second and third Canon, found to-day in the ' Prophets ' and ' Scriptures ' of our Old Testament ; but as this took place subsequent to the schism, the Samaritans have always ignored these additions.

In his *Sketch of Samaritan History*, J. W. Nutt remarks that the Samaritan creed was borrowed from the Jews : '.The Samaritans, powerless to invent, were compelled to borrow the

[1] *E. R. E.*, xi. 164b, Warren J. Moulton.

doctrines and usages then in vogue at Jerusalem.'[1] If this means merely that the Samaritan creed is based on the teaching of the Pentateuch, it is, of course, the Samaritan boast that this was simply true; but if the suggestion is that they acquired something which was not already their own, they would at once repudiate it, and, as we think, with good reason. When brothers quarrel and the stronger turns the weaker to the door, even though the former should succeed in later years in magnifying the family prestige, he does not thereby acquire the right to deny to the other the privilege of using the family name or any other possession common to both when they parted. As well might it be said that Protestants have borrowed the fundamental doctrines of Christianity from Roman Catholicism. In all such cases each party has equal right to the original stock common to both at the moment of separation, and for this neither is indebted to the other. When, therefore, the Samaritans took the Pentateuch with them as the rule of their lives, they only took what was theirs by inheritance, and were under no kind of obligation to their Southern neighbours for its possession.

The Samaritans are generally believed to have introduced into this old Law-book some important changes in the interest of their distinctive beliefs, and this reproach may prove to be well founded. Undoubtedly, though their doctrinal position has been throughout more conservative than that of their neighbours, some developments have taken place of a character not very different from those of the Jews. As will be seen later on, this is specially noticeable in regard to the Messiah and Eschatology. It is also contended that they have derived these without acknowledgement from their opponents, though it is more than possible that both were affected by the same general development of thought. Another factor in their development may perhaps be found in the rise of the Jewish Sadducean party during the Maccabean régime. The Sadducees were often compared by Jews to the Samaritans, and even confused with them sometimes, and it is highly probable that this conservative section of Jews had some share in restraining and moulding Samaritan ideas. In post-Christian centuries Samaritan views may have been modified also by the Karaites and Islam. But, when all reasonable admissions have

[1] Page 29.

been made, theirs was in the main an individual development, and their doctrines probably attained their final form within a century or two after the advent of Jesus Christ. And since they avoided so largely the accretions of the Pharisees, they are a welcome witness to the more conservative beliefs of ancient Judaism.

The Samaritan edition of the Pentateuch is our chief source for Samaritan beliefs. To this may be added a few comparatively late writings, and certain letters which Western correspondents have been fortunate enough to receive in modern times from members of the sect resident in Shechem, in which they state frankly their own conceptions of their traditional doctrines. These may be arranged conveniently in five sections, following the practice of the people themselves, viz. God, Moses, the Law, Mount Gerizim, and Eschatology. In a letter written to the 'Brethren in England,' dated 1672, a Samaritan correspondent states: 'We say: My faith is in Thee, YHVH; and in Moses, son of Amram, Thy servant; and in the holy Law; and in Mount Gerizim Bethel; and in the day of vengeance and recompense.'

(*a*) *God*. In general the Samaritan view of God resembles very closely that of the Jew. God is a pure spiritual being, and images and all other visible representations of Him are strictly forbidden. 'There is no God but the one.' 'There is nothing like Him.' Perhaps this ever-recurring and unusually emphatic insistence on the Divine Uniqueness may be ascribed to a later desire to oppose the Christian teaching respecting the 'Trinity.' Perhaps, too, they wished to oppose the Gnostic doctrines, with all their subordinate, semi-divine emanations.

Evidence of their anxiety to maintain this conception is found in the modifications which they introduced into certain passages of the Pentateuch, e.g. Genesis xx. 13, xxxi. 53, xxxv. 7. It is well known that one of the names of the deity, Elohim, is plural[1] in form, and in these passages the verbs joined to it are likewise written in the plural.[2] In each case the Samaritan Pentateuch changes these to the singular[3] in order to guard against a polytheistic interpretation of their faith.

Other changes occur with a view to the elimination of 'anthropomorphisms,' and to ensure an absolutely spiritual

[1] אלהים [2] Thus : נגלו ,ישפטו ,והחעו [3] Thus : נגלה ,ישפט ,והתעה

conception of the Deity. The following instances illustrate this practice:

JEWISH		SAMARITAN
'They *saw* the God of Israel'	(Exod. xxiv. 10)	'they *feared* the God,' &c.
'they *beheld* God'	(Exod. xxiv. 11)	'they *cleaved to* God.'
'*God* came to Balaam'	(Num. xxii. 20)	'An *angel* of God came,' &c.
'*God* met Balaam'	(Num. xxiii. 4)	'An *angel* of God found,' &c.
'And *Jahveh* put a word,' &c.	(Num. xxiii. 5)	'An *angel* of God,' &c.

In Gen. xlviii. 16 the Jewish Pentateuch reads: 'The angel which hath redeemed me from all evil, bless the lads.' But the Samaritan Pentateuch, by making a very simple change, reads: 'The king which hath,' &c. Here the intention is to show that Jacob received his redemption not from a mere angel, but from the 'king,' i.e. God Himself.

In Exod. xv. 3 Jehovah is described as 'a man of war.' This the Samaritan version seems to regard as derogatory to Jehovah's dignity. It changes it therefore to 'Jehovah is a hero of war.'

In like manner, man was not created in 'God's image,' but in that of 'the angels,' and it was not 'God,' but an 'angel' who spoke to Moses at the burning bush. God is 'eternal, without beginning, without a companion. He uttered a word without a mouth and the world was created from nothing. He rested on the seventh day, but not from weariness. Possibly, owing to the unapproachable attributes of God, we find prayers offered through the mediation of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, of Joseph, the seventy Elders, the holy angels, and more especially of Moses.'[1]

The Jews have on different occasions accused the Samaritans of worshipping idols buried under the terebinth at Shechem by Jacob,[2] a dove,[3] and a god called Ashima. But no tittle of proof is forthcoming in support of this accusation. The last is due to a culpable error which can be traced without much trouble. It is a well-known fact that the Jews avoided the use of the sacred name 'Jehovah,' using in its place 'Adonai,' and afterwards 'The Name' simply. As the elucidation of the error turns on this latter term, it is necessary to say that its Hebrew form is השם (i.e. 'Hashem'). Under a similar impulse of reverence, the Samaritans also sought

[1] Cowley, *E. B.*, col. 4262. [2] Gen. xxxv. 4; *Ber. Bab.*, 81. [3] *Cholin*, 6a.

to avoid the use of the sacred name, and substituted for it the word 'Shemma' (שמא), the Aramaic equivalent of 'The Name,' or 'Hashem.' It is probably, therefore, from this word 'Shemma,' thus innocently used, that the supposed worship of a god 'Ashima' was evolved by the Jews. Such a needless misunderstanding could hardly have arisen had there not been a predisposition which does the Jews little credit.

Did they believe in angels? Some writers seriously doubt it, but without sufficient reason. It seems probable that belief in them did not attain any considerable development until somewhat late in their history, as was the case with the Jews. Angels are referred to in the Samaritan Pentateuch as in the Jewish, but the full doctrine is only stated in their later literature. The name by which they are generally designated is Malakhim, i.e. Messengers, and they are believed to occupy an intermediary position between God and man. The functions ascribed to them do not differ materially from those in Judaism and Christianity, though they were never so elaborately developed as in later Judaism. Samaritans believed also in evil spirits, such as Azazel, Belial, and the Hornet.[1]

(*b*) *Moses.* The position occupied by Moses in the Samaritan faith is very remarkable, indeed unique. Not content with the exalted place accorded to him by the Jews as a great prophet of God, they regarded him as the sole and complete medium of divine revelation to Man. He becomes in short an object of faith. This exaltation is doubtless based on the belief that he was the one and only author of the Pentateuch, the only Law-book acknowledged by the community.

The terms in which he is always referred to are quite bewildering in their boldness and unrelieved grandeur. He is called 'the pure one,' 'the light of the world.' He is the one prophet and messenger of God for all ages. An apparently trifling verbal change in a well-known passage in Deuteronomy[2] is very significant. The writer, according to the Jewish version, says of Moses: 'There hath not arisen a prophet since in Israel like unto Moses, whom the Lord knew face to face.' The Samaritan version changes the 'perfect tense' into one with a 'future' signification, and reads: 'And there shall not arise,' &c.[3]

[1] Cf. Exod. xxiii. 28.

[2] I.e. from לא קם to לא יקם

[3] Deut. xxxiv. 10.

Another passage,[1] in which Moses promised that Jehovah will give them another prophet like himself, is restricted in its application by the Samaritans to Joshua. In a letter written by a modern Samaritan, the writer states: 'We begin our discourse with the name of God and conclude with the mention of Moses.' All other prophets are entirely superfluous, for everything was revealed by God to Moses in the Holy Mount. He is above all patriarchs, kings, and priests, and the Messiah Himself when He comes will not be superior to him. Even prayers may be offered in his name.

It can hardly be a matter of surprise, after these statements, to find that pre-existence is ascribed to this great prophet, and that he entered this lower world in a miraculous manner. From the very beginning of things he was ordained by God to reveal His will to His people, and having accomplished his task Moses returned to heaven to dwell in the Divine presence.

But though in comparison with Moses all other men occupy quite a subordinate position, Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, Joseph, Aaron, Eleazar, and Phineas, are held in peculiar esteem. And because of their peculiar holiness they are fitted to confer certain benefits on their faithful followers.

(*c*) *The Law.* To the Samaritan, the word Law was synonymous with the word Pentateuch; the Pentateuch was their Law, that and nothing else. And in this determined adhesion to the Law of Moses they were not without some justification in fact and history. The Pentateuch is certainly much more than a Law-book. It contains, in addition to laws, historical records and traditions, but its great distinction is that it is a Book of Laws. Moreover, for Jew and Samaritan alike, religion, especially in its earlier stages, was largely an affair of practice; commands, followed by obedience. Thus, the teachings and exhortations of Prophets, the individual and national experiences of Psalmists, the semi-philosophical broodings and admonitions of the Wise were for the Samaritans both unnecessary and unwanted. The Pharisaic section of the Jewish community had, of course, gone much further. A great system of Oral Tradition had been developed which was the pride of the Scribes and Pharisees, and the bitter aversion of their opponents, the Sadducees.

Needless to say, the Samaritans did not follow the Scribes

[1] Deut. xxxiv. 10.

and Pharisees, and refused absolutely to allow to Oral Tradition any authority whatsoever. From their own standpoint this was, of course, inevitable and correct. When the founder of the Samaritan community left Jerusalem for Gerizim to build there the new Temple, he based its ritual on the Pentateuch, and ever afterwards it was upon this volume that the Samaritans took their stand. As time passed, and the development of Tradition became so prominent a feature with the Jews, the Pentateuch became for the Samaritans the evidence and symbol of their ancient origin. The Jews had shown their degeneracy, so the Samaritans held, by presuming to add to the commands of Moses; they in the North proudly claimed that they were content to retain them intact.

That they regarded their Law with the utmost veneration is beyond cavil or dispute. A Jewish Rabbi, Simeon, son of Gamaliel, pays the Samaritans a deservedly high tribute when he says: 'Every command which the Cutheans (i.e. the Samaritans) keep, they observe more strictly than the Israelites.'[1] And with this all witnesses are in substantial agreement, though of course not usually depreciating the fidelity of the Jews themselves. The rigidity with which they observed their Laws is, probably, illustrated in the amazement expressed to Jesus by the woman at the well,[2] that a Jew should so far forget his own regulations as to ask for drink from one who was a Samaritan. And this is all the more striking in that its observance implied unlimited contempt for her own nation. Contempt for Law was to her incomprehensible.

The terms in which the Law is described are very similar to those used of Moses, the Law-giver. The Law is 'a fragment of the hidden world, increasing wisdom for all generations'; 'the Law is a spark of God's vesture'; Marka, a great Samaritan theologian of the later fourth century (A.D.), says: 'The Law came out of the fire; the Tables were sundered from the Divine essence.' When, in later literature, a description is given of the circumstances in which the Law was given by God to His servant Moses, it transcends even that of the Jews in glory and grandeur. To quote Montgomery: 'All things seen and unseen were present; all angels in their ranks, the stars and the constellations, even the dead with the living; the whole universe trembled before this divine revelation.'[3]

[1] *Bab. Chalim*, 4a. [2] John iv. 8 f. [3] Montgomery, *Samaritans*, p. 233 f.

God wrote the Law with His own hand and He intended it for all time. No additions could be necessary, it was perfect and final. By knowledge of it men gain all that is essential for life here and hereafter.

(*d*) *Mount Gerizim.* The supreme importance of Mount Gerizim, as the central place of worship, occupies the central position in the Samaritan creed. On this point they have always been in deadly conflict with the Jews, as readers of the Fourth Gospel are aware. The remark of the woman of Samaria reveals the persistence of this article of faith: 'Our fathers worshipped in this mountain; and ye say that in Jerusalem is the place where men ought to worship.'[1] Just as the Jews maintained, as an axiom of their religion, that Jerusalem was God's appointed place for the worship of His Name, so, with equal conviction, the Samaritans affirmed the same of Mount Gerizim. And just as the Jews regarded the Gerizim Temple as schismatical, so, too, the Samaritans in regard to that on Mount Zion.

However erroneous and even absurd this Samaritan contention may appear to modern readers, accustomed as they are to the idea of Jerusalem and its Temple as the centre and soul of Jewish life, an unprejudiced examination of earlier history will go far to show that the Samaritans were not without some ground for their exaltation of Gerizim.

Abraham encamped in this neighbourhood in first entering Palestine and bought a tomb at Shechem.[2] They claim that it was here that Isaac was offered as a sacrifice,[3] and still show a trench in the south-eastern portion of the mountain where it is believed the altar was built. They likewise hold that it was at Shechem that Melchizedek, King of Salem, and the King of Sodom met Abraham.[4] Both Jacob and Joseph were buried at Shechem,[5] and there too Jacob, on returning from his temporary exile, built an altar to El-Elohe-Israel and bought a parcel of ground.[6] Even Bethel, where Jacob had his vision, is to be identified with Gerizim. At a later time Moses commanded the people to gather together to Mount Ebal and Mount Gerizim, for the recital of the Law of God, and this was faithfully observed by his successor Joshua.[7] And it was

[1] John iv. 20. [2] Gen. xii. 6; Acts vii. 16. [3] Gen. xxii. 2.
[4] Gen. xiv. 17 ff. [5] Acts vii. 16; Joshua xxiv. 32. [6] Gen. xxxiii. 18 ff.
[7] Deut. xi. 29, 32, xxvii. 11, 12; Joshua viii. 33 f.

upon the stones of the altar on Gerizim (not on Ebal, according to the Samaritan Pentateuch, Deut. xxxvii. 4) that Joshua wrote the words of the Law. At close of his life the same leader summoned the people together to this place to take his final leave of them. Jotham's parable against the men of Shechem and Abimelech was uttered from Gerizim.[1] After the death of Solomon the tribes assembled at Shechem for the election of a new king, and it was there that their quarrel with Rehoboam broke out.[2] Then, as we have seen already, Mount Gerizim was chosen by the Samaritans as the site of the Northern Temple when the cleavage between them and the Jews became final, and the sacred building remained as the rallying-point until destroyed by John Hyrcanus *circa* 128 B.C.[3]

There is, no doubt, much that is merely traditional in some of these claims, but even so the remainder possess quite sufficient historical truth to justify the Samaritan people in the profound veneration and respect with which they regard Shechem and Mount Gerizim. And indeed it must be acknowledged that in comparison with these places Jerusalem was something of an upstart. It was not till David's time that it came into the hands of the Israelites at all. And when its Temple was built by Solomon it had as rivals not only Shechem, but such sacred places as Bethel, Shiloh, Gilgal, Ramah, and Beersheba, all of which had for a long time occupied a great position in the affections and veneration of the people.

An incomparable dignity, however, came to the Jerusalem Temple when the Sacred Ark was deposited in its Holy of Holies, and this, together with the growing importance of Jerusalem as a city, raised it after a time to its supremacy in the nation's religious life. The Samaritans, on their part, afterwards developed the tradition that there was a cave in the Holy Mountain where the Sacred Ark lay hidden, and some claim that it still exists there in some spiritualized form. But no improbability on this or any other matter has ever been allowed to diminish in the slightest degree the Samaritan belief in the importance of Gerizim. One is not surprised, therefore, to find that they designate it by the highest titles, such as : the Blessed Mount, the Eternal Hill, the House of God, the

[1] Judges ix. 7–21.
[2] 1 Kings xii.
[3] *Ant.*, xi. viii. 2, 4, xiii. ix 1 ; *War*, i. ii. 6.

House of the powerful God, &c.[1] Even to-day, though the sacred Temple is no more, Gerizim is still the place upon which is celebrated the annual Passover.

(*e*) *Eschatology, including the Messiah.* The subjects covered by the word Eschatology are a peculiarly interesting and important section of the Samaritan creed, and upon it modern students have devoted much time and labour. It deals not only with the doctrines of the Last Things in the usual acceptation of that term, but more especially with the Advent of the Messiah. The casual remark of the woman of Samaria to Jesus makes it quite clear that the Samaritans were at that time expecting a Messiah, and that He might come immediately. And, if further evidence were desired, it is found in the tumult which Pilate repressed at the foot of Gerizim,[2] as well as in the great success obtained by Simon Magus.[3] And this is confirmed by Justin Martyr in the second century of our era.[4] But, as with the Jews, this belief existed at many and various stages of development, both before and after New Testament times.

When, in the fifth century B.C. Jews and Samaritans finally parted company, the eschatological ideas common to both were extremely meagre and hazy, and no striking development is known to us during the next two and a half centuries. But the dangers and sacrifices of the Maccabean Age, which proved so mighty a stimulus to the more heroic Jews, could not have left the Samaritans unaffected, and it is highly probable that their eschatological thought was at that period under considerable obligation to the Jews, though never becoming so elaborate and complex as theirs. It is to the everlasting credit of both peoples, that so far from permitting the bitter vicissitudes of the centuries to cause them to abandon their hope in God, they on the contrary looked forward with increasing eagerness to His certain intervention on their behalf at some time known only to Himself. This intervention would inaugurate the Messianic Age, when all their wrongs would be righted and the divine kingdom of righteousness established on earth.

According to the Samaritans, history is divisible into four

[1] Cf. Mills: *Three Months' Residence at Nablus*, &c.; Montgomery, *Samaritans*, 235 f.

[2] *Ant.*, XVIII. iv. 1. [3] Acts viii. 9 ff. [4] *Apol.*, I. 53.

great periods, marked by the favour or disfavour of the Most High. They are :

1. The Age of Adamic perfection, ending with the ' Fall.'
2. The Age of Disfavour, called the Panuta, which continued until the Law was given by Moses.
3. This was succeeded by the time of Divine Favour, called the Ridhwan, which was brought to an end by the sin of Eli.
4. Eli's sin, which consisted in the removal of the Ark from Gerizim to Shiloh, brought in the second sad period of Disfavour.

Jeroboam accentuated this sin when he set up altars at Bethel and Dan. This period still continues, and can only be ended when the Messiah shall appear to restore all things.[1] In former days it was believed that this appearance would take place 6,000 years after the completion of Creation. But the long and wearisome delay has considerably shaken their faith in the accuracy of this estimate, and now the majority are content to wait in hope for the Messiah's coming without presuming to say when that much-desired event will occur.

Their name for the Messiah is ' Taheb,' the exact meaning of which for long perplexed philologists. The most probable explanation is that suggested by Gesenius, the reasonableness of which is obvious enough, once it is pointed out, on both philological and historical grounds. Taheb (תהב), or Shaheb (שהב), is derived from the verb תוב or שוב, which means ' to return, do again, restore.' The substantive, therefore, would mean ' the restorer.' Modern Samaritans give a meaning not very different from this. In a letter written by one of their number to E. Kautzsch, and published by him in the *Zeitschrift des deutschen Pal stina-Vereins* in 1885, the writer says : ' This word תהב (Taheb) means the one who converts the people.' This may be taken to signify ' the one who turns the people back again to God.' Possibly the idea was not uninfluenced by a passage in the Prophet Malachi : ' Behold, I will send you Elijah the prophet before the great and terrible of the Lord shall come. And he shall turn the heart of the fathers to the children, and the heart of the children to their fathers ; lest I come and smite the earth with a curse.'[2] If this origin is well founded, it would seem

[1] Cf. John iv. 25. [2] Mal. iv. 5 f.

to indicate an indebtedness to the Jewish prophets which the Samaritans would not care to allow.

As might be expected, the Samaritan community agreed with the minority of the Jews in depreciating the House of Judah,[1] and looking to some other quarter for the 'Coming One.' Judah was unworthy of so great an honour. The House of Joseph had always, as they believed, occupied a superior position in the national life, and it was fitting that from it the Taheb should arise. Moreover, an unprejudiced reading of the 'Blessing of Jacob' shows at once how solid was the ground upon which the Samaritans based this claim. In that ancient document Judah is dismissed in very few and unimportant words. Joseph, on the contrary, occupies the position of honour, as witness the following:

'Let the blessing come upon the head of Joseph.
And upon the crown of the head of him that was separate from his brethren.
The firstling of the flock, majesty is his;
And his horns are the horns of the wild-ox.
With them he shall push the peoples all of them, even the ends of the earth:
And they are the ten thousands of Ephraim,
And they are the thousands of Manasseh.'[2]

In regard to the type or character of the Messiah, the Samaritans held that He would conform to the pattern of their greatest ancestor, Moses, as foretold in his words:

'The Lord thy God will raise up unto thee a prophet from the midst of thee, of thy brethren, like unto me; unto Him shall ye hearken.'[3]

But though great, the 'Taheb' would not equal his great archetype, Moses. In this, of course, they differed from the Jews. On His Advent the Taheb would inaugurate the Millennium, when the Tabernacle and the full glory of Jehovah's worship would be at last restored to Mount Gerizim, and this would be accompanied by the material prosperity of the people. Then would come the great and final conflict between the powers of good and evil. The Messiah would

[1] *Vide* part i. vi. ii. [2] Deut. xxxiii. 16 f. [3] Deut. xviii. 15.

then die, and this event would be followed by the long-expected Day of Vengeance and Recompense accompanied by awful and world-wide disasters. The Resurrection would follow and the final Judgement, in which God would be aided by the angelic host. In connexion with this dread event Moses is to reappear to make intercession for his true and faithful followers. After the Judgement, the pious will be permitted to enter the Garden of Eden, which is located on Mount Gerizim, and the wicked will be cast into the fire.

II. Institutions

In regard to these there is little that calls for remark, as in most respects their Institutions are similar to those of the Jews. Referring to the period immediately succeeding the final separation from the Jews, Josephus states that 'if any one were accused by those at Jerusalem of having eaten things common, or of having broken the Sabbath, or of any other offence of the like nature, he fled away to the Shechemites, and said that he was accused unjustly.'[1] Quite possibly this may have been true, but what advantage he would gain it is not easy to see, as, of course, he would be obliged to demonstrate in practice the injustice of the accusation against him. Like the Jews, the Samaritans had their Temple and, for local purposes, the Synagogue; also their quota of ordinary priests, over whom was set the high-priest, a member of the tribe of Levi who received tithes from the people. They were most careful in the observance of the Sacred Seasons, which they believed were instituted by Moses. These were seven in number, and are enjoined in the later priestly legislation recorded in Leviticus xxiii. Three times a year the people made a pilgrimage to Mount Gerizim in order to celebrate the Feasts of Passover, Pentecost, and Tabernacles. But it was only in connexion with the Passover-feast that they offered sacrifices. This celebration has always aroused the deepest interest of modern travellers to Gerizim, and from the arresting description given by one of them we take the following passage:

> 'They go to the top of Mount Gerizim at least a week before the feast, pitch their tents, and there remain two weeks. They observe the feast seven days. . . . They all

[1] *Ant.*, xi. viii. 7.

attend the festival, even though they are ill. . . . The observances on the day of the Passover are as follows: They begin at sunset with singing, in which all take part. As a rule they kill the lambs needed for the congregation at sunset. These are white, one year old, without blemish. . . . As a rule they eat the lambs late at night. All the people are dressed in white, and they begin with prayer and singing. . . . While slaughtering the animals they make a fire ready in two places. One of the fires is prepared for burning the wool, the hoofs, the horns, and the entrails. Everything that is not eaten is burned. . . . The other fire is prepared a long time before the sacrifices. They dig a pit, ten or twelve feet in depth, and in this they make the fire five or six hours before they sacrifice. A special priest feeds the fire all the time. When the lambs have been made ready by the priests, they put the poles through the animals from end to end. At a signal from the priest they quickly put the lambs, seven or eight in number, into the pit. All the while they are singing in the Samaritan language. After they have placed the lambs in the pit, they all go to a special place on the mountain, including men, women, and children, and kneel in rows. The priest has the Law of Moses. When he prays he has a mantle on his shoulders. They repeat their prayers by rote, with their faces towards the south, and assume different attitudes. When the time comes for removing the sacrifices, the priest approaches the pit and makes a brief prayer. Then the people remove the covering from the top of the pit, and afterwards lift up the poles, on which are the lambs, one by one. . . . None can eat of the lambs but those who are circumcised, and who are (ceremonially) clean. Each family, and those who are reckoned with them, take a lamb and put it in a basket, and sit around it in a circle. The priest begins with a short prayer and song. After this, standing, they eat the flesh of the lambs in haste with unleavened bread and herbs. None of the Moslems and Christians who are watching this ceremony may partake of the lamb, though some of the generous Samaritans offer them unleavened bread and bitter herbs.'[1]

[1] From Dr. Daud Katibah, Nablus, July 26, 1900; quoted by Curtiss, *Primitive Semitic Religion*, &c., p. 264 f.

Chapter IX

RELATIONS WITH JESUS AND THE EARLY CHRISTIANS

The light which the New Testament throws on the character of this sect has been too much ignored and, as one cannot but think, much to the loss of a true picture. This has been pointed out recently by Montgomery, who says, 'The New Testament has not been sufficiently applied for the understanding of the Jewish treatment of the Samaritans, and the commentators have largely failed in the treatment of the several pertinent passages to apprehend the status of the Samaritans according to the Jewish mind of the first century. But the volume throws considerable light upon our quest.'[1]

A survey of the documents shows the following features:

In Mark the Samaritans are not mentioned at all. Evidently their history would not interest his readers.

In Matthew there is only one reference, which records Christ's 'prohibition' when sending His apostles on an evangelistic tour.[2]

Luke is the only Synoptist who records any intercourse between the Samaritans and Jesus. He mentions the churlish villagers whose conduct aroused the anger of James and John,[3] narrates the story of the Good Samaritan,[4] and the grateful Samaritan leper.[5]

In the Fourth Gospel we have the story of the Samaritan Woman at the Well, to which is added the enthusiastic reception of Jesus by the neighbouring town.[6] The same writer also reports that the Jews in their anger taunted Jesus with being a Samaritan.[7]

In the Acts of the Apostles we have one important and two or three other slighter references. Thus there is the intimation

[1] *Samaritans*, p. 157. [2] Matt. x. 5. [3] Luke ix. 52 ff. [4] Luke x. 25 ff.
[5] Luke xvii. 11. [6] John iv. 4–42. [7] John viii. 48.

of Jesus that the Samaritans are now to be included in the activities of the Christian evangelists.[1] Shortly afterwards follows at some length the story of the evangelization of Samaria.[2] The Church in Samaria is also referred to in ix. 31 and xv. 3.

Before examining these references in detail it should be borne in mind that the feeling of the two peoples towards each other was at this time extremely embittered, more particularly on the side of the Jews. Of this quite a number of instances present themselves: e.g. there is the refusal on the part of the Samaritan village to receive Jesus because He was on His way to Jerusalem[3]; and to this, perhaps, one ought to add the reluctance of the woman at the well to have anything to do with one who was a Jew.[4] On the Jewish side we have the fierce indignation of James and John against the intolerant Samaritans[5]; the unwillingness of the lawyer to pollute his lips with the word 'Samaritan' when common fairness might have led one to expect it[6]; then, too, the Samaritans are termed aliens, even by Jesus[7]; and it is probably because of this bitter feeling that the disciples were not permitted to preach to them[8]; finally, when the Jews wanted to say their worst against Jesus, they found 'Samaritan' the most objectionable epithet they could think of.[9]

We have had other evidence of the existence of this strained relationship, but it is perhaps not superfluous to point to its presence in the New Testament, as it gives a better background for studying the different allusions.

I. Relations with Jesus

1. First, then, we take the prohibition of Jesus to the disciples as they set out on their mission: 'Go not into any way of the Gentiles and enter not into any city of the Samaritans.'[10] This passage is peculiar to Matthew, and is in striking contrast to the post-Resurrection command recorded by the same writer: 'Go ye forth and make disciples of all the nations.'[11] Jackson-Lake and W. C. Allen are doubtful whether this later command proceeds from the same source as the earlier prohibition.[12] But even if from a different source, it is of the same

[1] Acts i. 8. [2] Acts viii. 4–25. [3] Luke ix. 53. [4] John iv. 9.
[5] Luke ix. 54. [6] Luke x. 37. [7] Luke xvii. 18. [8] Matt. x. 5.
[9] John viii. 48. [10] Matt. x. 5. [11] Matt. xxviii. 19.
[12] *Beg. of Christianity*, i. 123; *Com. Mt.*, ad loc.

tenor as the words of Jesus quoted in Acts i. 8, and in both cases it is clear that, after the death and resurrection of Jesus, some change had taken place in the situation which rendered the prohibition no longer necessary.

It is certainly noteworthy that neither Mark nor Luke takes account of this prohibition.[1] Luke, at any rate, abundantly disabuses our minds of any idea that Jesus entertained animosity against the Samaritans. It would seem that the instruction was based upon policy, and that it was necessary for the time being, in the general interest of the mission, not to offend the Jews if it could be avoided. Hence the Samaritans are to be ignored, or, to be more exact, Jesus does not go out of His way to evangelize them Himself, and does not allow the disciples to attempt it at all. Not improbably there was a further reason, viz. that the disciples were not yet sufficiently in sympathy with the wider outlook of Jesus to undertake such a task. Luke ix. 53 seems to justify this fear. It is interesting to note in passing that when speaking of the Samaritans Jesus distinguishes between them and Gentiles.

2. Luke ix. 51 ff. This is the account of the Samaritans' refusal to receive Jesus because, as the Evangelist says, He seemed to be going up to Jerusalem.

The fact that Jesus and His disciples had planned to go through Samaria is in itself reassuring. Sometimes He went by the route east of the Jordan, but apparently this was from choice and not from fear of molestation. Josephus assures us that it was quite customary for a Galilean to take the central route, though on one occasion it proved terribly disastrous.[2] As an offset to the churlishness of the one village it appears that there was no difficulty in the case of another near by, for there is no reason to suppose, as some do, that the other village was not Samaritan. The remark of Lagrange is worth repeating: 'Samaria had not the personal hostility against Jesus which the Jewish leaders will show. It is like a Gentile nation. Jesus passes by without being drawn to them as He will be towards Jerusalem, but without threatening them with the same catastrophes.[3] Perhaps the really disturbing feature in the incident is to be found less in the hostility of the Samaritans than in the spirit manifested

[1] Cf. Mark iii. 13 ff.; Luke vi. 6 ff.
[2] *Ant.* xx. vi. 1.
[3] *Com. Luc*, p. 286.

by James and John. Their fierce anger is hardly called for by the circumstances, and one wonders whether it would have been aroused had the village been Jewish rather than Samaritan. Perhaps it was in keeping with their hasty temperament, but it is none the less significant of the spirit of the time. Ambrose asks, ' Quid mirum filios tonitrui fulgurare voluisse ? '

3. Luke x. 25 ff. narrates the parable, or story, of the Good Samaritan. It seems quite as likely that it records an actual incident, as that it was merely a parable constructed for the purpose of teaching a lesson. And in that case it is even more striking than is usually supposed. It tells just as strongly in favour of the Samaritans as the preceding incident tells against them, and it is significant that the Evangelist should have placed the one in such close proximity to the other. Still, its significance ought not to be exaggerated, as though all Samaritans would have been as kind-hearted as this one. And it may also be that the Jewish representatives were unusually callous. But the story is certainly intended to make clear that Samaritans were generally less hard towards the Jews than the Jews towards them, and this deduction is supported by nearly every pertinent fact known to us. One cannot help noting again the grudging reply of the Jewish lawyer when asked to pronounce upon the conduct of the three men. The obvious reply was the one word ' Samaritan,' but his utter detestation of both the people and their name evidently stood in his way, and he replied in the well-known circumlocution : ' He that showed mercy on him.' His hatred could not pass the test. The great daring of Jesus in thus attributing good-will to a Samaritan traveller ought not to pass unnoticed.

4. Luke xvii. 11 ff. This gives us the story of the grateful Samaritan leper. Here, without any question, we are confronted with an actual occurrence. How the healed man postponed his reunion with his friends and family until he had showed gratitude to his benefactor captivates every reader. The privileged Jews thought only of themselves. It is a beautiful and unexpected testimonial to the despised pariah folk of the middle province.

5. John iv. 4–42 gives in detail the conversation with the Samaritan woman and the eager reception of Jesus by the people of Sychar. The difficulties in the way of accepting this

story as genuine history are well known. Baur, Strauss, and Holtzmann, among others, entirely deny its historicity, and Headlam, while not rejecting it altogether, will not commit himself to its details.[1] Apart from the general difficulty presented by the Fourth Gospel, one is struck at once by the fact that it is a conversation at which the only two persons present appear to have been Jesus and the woman, and that therefore a strict verbal report could hardly be expected. Then, too, one recalls the command of Jesus[2] to the disciples not to go among the Samaritans. Possibly it is a sufficient answer to this to point out that the present intercourse came unsought, and that the 'prohibition' was probably due in part to the immaturity of the disciples and their consequent inability to deal with specially difficult circumstances. The question of date is not unimportant; the present incident seems to have occurred prior to the animosity which the work of Jesus ultimately aroused among the Jews, and so threatened but little danger. For ourselves, we accept the general accuracy of the story; it is highly improbable that it would have been invented by any one so late in the century, and the Evangelist was under no temptation to 'work it up' from an uncertain legend. Nevertheless, one may feel a measure of reserve in regard to the language employed in one or more cases.

Viewed from our present standpoint the story presents several extremely interesting features. Verse 4, which tells of the determination to pass through Samaria, we have already referred to, showing, as it does, that the molestation of Jews by Samaritans was an unusual occurrence. Verse 8 makes it clear that however strict Jewish regulations were, some articles of food might be purchased in a Samaritan town. This is in accordance with statements in Jewish sources which tell us that fish, fruit, and vegetables might be purchased without violating the Law. Whether the disciples of Jesus restricted themselves to these we are not told, and it may be that Galileans were not too careful in observing Rabbinical requirements. There is no suggestion that this matter presented any difficulty to Jesus. In verse 9 the estrangement between Jews and Samaritans is stated simply as an undeniable fact, and to this the Evangelist adds a corroborative explanation,

[1] *Life and Teaching of Jesus Christ*, p. 231. [2] Matt. x. 5.

though it should be remarked that some manuscripts omit this.[1] Apparently, however, neither Jesus nor the woman was greatly troubled by this embargo. In verses 20 ff. it is quite evident that the old and ever new rivalry between Jerusalem and Gerizim was still alive, and on this matter the words of Jesus stand as among the noblest He ever uttered. Verse 22, however, seems a somewhat harsh interruption and, though it would evoke no comment from an ordinary Jew, on His lips it seems unusually severe. Nor do commentators like Westcott and Dods explain the dictum very satisfactorily. To condemn all Samaritan worship when dealing with a simple-minded woman strikes one as being unnecessary, and those who throw doubt upon the details of this story have perhaps their strongest support here. However, if we omit the verse altogether the passage runs quite well. The noteworthy feature of verse 25 is that it removes all doubt as to the reality of the Samaritan expectation of a Messiah, and if the date of the record be brought down to the end of the century, its preservation becomes all the more striking. Verses 29 f. show that, despite all their racial prejudices, the Samaritans were quite willing to consider the possibility of a Jewish Messiah. This reversal of their traditional attitude is certainly remarkable, and is in favourable contrast with the Jews, who resented the idea of a peasant Messiah, even though a Jew, just because He was not of the type they expected. Verses 39–42 tell us of the townspeople's eagerness to have intercourse with this Jewish claimant to Messiahship. At first 'they kept beseeching Him,' with the result that Jesus stayed with them two days, and later, we are told, they believed on Him. Possibly the depth of their conviction is presented to the reader in a somewhat sanguine manner, and the story of the later incident in the Acts of the Apostles may partly account for this. On the whole, the episode throws a most favourable light on the spiritual aptitudes of the Samaritan people.

6. In John viii. 48 the Jews call Jesus a Samaritan and say that He has a devil. This stigma was spoken in the course of an unusually frank conversation between Jesus and the Jews on the subject of the spiritual paternity of the latter. They assumed without hesitation that Abraham was their father,

[1] Omitted in ℵ*, D, found in ℵ*ᶜ· A, B, C, L.

and in this assumption did not distinguish between physical and spiritual origin. When Jesus pointed out this, and told them that they were of their father the devil, they retorted in their anger that He was a Samaritan and demon-possessed. Their obvious purpose was to hurl at Him, in their fury, the most objectionable term they could think of. Apart from their display of anger against Jesus, the observation reveals the Jewish feeling of utter contempt for the Samaritans. To be a ' Samaritan ' and to be ' devil-possessed,' if not exactly equivalent terms, were yet on the same level in their eyes.

Conclusions

Our survey of these incidents in the Gospels shows the extreme bitterness which existed between the two sections of the people. But it is more obvious among Jews than Samaritans. The contact of Jesus with the Samaritans furnishes us with only two objectionable incidents ; the refusal of the Samaritan villagers—whose conduct was, however, counter-balanced at the next village, and the initial pertness of the woman at the well. Otherwise, if the Fourth Gospel may be relied upon, Jesus found them responsive to the truth, grateful to Himself, and generous towards their opponents.

On His part, Jesus treated them with His usual kindliness, and neither He nor His disciples avoided their land or their food. Yet, while in this respect so different from other Jews, He did not go to the other extreme. He recognized the difficulties of the situation, and during His lifetime forbade the disciples to extend their labours to their province. But so far as one can judge, this was due less to Samaritan backwardness than to Jewish prejudice. His eulogy of the Good Samaritan is a striking instance of His courage, and a quiet rebuke of His own proud people.

II. Relations with the Early Christians

The passages are all found in the Acts of the Apostles. Though it is true we find ourselves here in contact with Samaritans in process of becoming Christians, we can observe, nevertheless, their state of mind at the moment the new truth was introduced to them. An opportunity is also afforded of studying the real views of Jews towards their old antagonists

once they abandoned their hereditary prejudices and regarded their fellow-countrymen in an unbiased manner.

1. Acts i. 8 tells us that after His resurrection, when Jesus was indicating to His apostles the widespread nature of their mission, He includes Samaria: 'And ye shall be My witnesses both in Jerusalem, and in all Judea and Samaria, and unto the uttermost part of the earth.'

The injunction reminds us of Matt. xxviii. 19, but is more definite. The earlier embargo has been removed. Perhaps it is that the disciples are now better equipped and their prejudices dispersed, though in regard to the Gentiles this was far from being the case; witness the episode relating to Cornelius and the controversy about Gentile circumcision. We also note that the Samaritans are again distinguished from all other non-Jews. But the chief significance of the command is found in the removal of the necessity for considering Jewish prejudices, thus permitting the gospel to pursue its course unfettered any longer by artificial hindrances. Jesus had evidently never entertained any doubt as to the suitability of the Samaritans to enter the Kingdom of God.

2. Acts viii. 4–25 tells of the evangelization of Samaria (or Shechem, as suggested by Montgomery[1]); first the city, and then several of the villages.

Owing to the persecution following the execution of Stephen, all the Christians save the apostles were 'scattered abroad throughout the region of Judea and Samaria.' This undesigned contact with the Samaritans led Philip the deacon to proclaim 'unto them the Christ.' His preaching was accompanied by 'signs,' and 'the multitude gave heed with one accord unto the things that were spoken by Philip when they heard and saw the signs that he did.' A certain magician named Simon had gained great influence over them by the exhibition of his marvellous deeds, but Philip's 'good tidings concerning the Kingdom of God and the name of Jesus Christ' destroyed Simon's power over them, and they believed and were baptized. Apparently no question of propriety arose in the Evangelist's mind. On the news reaching Jerusalem, the apostles dispatched Peter and John to visit the new converts, and they initiated them into the full experience of the Christian life. On their way back to Jerusalem the two apostles preached in

[1] *Samaritans*, p. 163.

several Samaritan villages, but the result of their work is not disclosed.

The story furnishes us with several features of high importance. There is an entire absence of any racial difficulty. Philip, Peter, and John, and the Jerusalem authorities, appear to have acted just as they would had the opportunity arisen among Jews. This is all the more striking when we recall the serious difficulties which Peter felt in the case of the Gentile Cornelius. Apart from their historic prejudice, the average Jew knew full well that a Samaritan was fundamentally of the same faith as himself and an inheritor of the Kingdom of God. Further, no question of circumcision arose. A Samaritan was circumcised just like a Jew, and though the act was performed by his own priests, it was recognized as quite valid. With Gentiles it was otherwise, and a compromise became necessary; either the rite must be performed or, after Paul's contention, overlooked. But there was no need for any such special arrangements when dealing with Samaritans.

The history of Simon Magus has occupied a large space in discussions of this incident, and, as we are disposed to think, out of all proportion to its merit. The story need not be rehearsed here in detail, as it is so well known. Ramsay's description will suffice for our purpose: 'Simon had gained great influence through certain wonders and miracles that he had wrought in Samaria. These struck the people with astonishment (verses 9 and 11), and they were so deeply impressed that they regarded the magician as a manifestation of the divine power in human form. He was an epiphany (to use the Greek term), or avatar (to use the Hindu), of that Supreme Power of which even the gods themselves are only partial and inferior envisagements and embodiments. The Samaritans called him the "Power of God which is called Great," a very remarkable title.'[1] Those interested in the legends connected with his name will find ample information in the Commentaries and Encyclopaedias. The long story is based on the references in Justin Martyr,[2] the Clementine Homilies,[3] Irenaeus,[4] and Tertullian,[5] and it is probable that the later writers are dependent for most, if not all, of their information on Justin, who was a native of Samaria.

[1] *Trustworthiness of New Testament*, p. 117.
[2] *Apol.*, i. 26, 56.
[3] i. 15, ii. 22.
[4] *Against Heresies*, i. 23.
[5] *Apol.*, xiii.

Simon was apparently a Samaritan, but though his influence over the people was very great it was not unique, even if his pretensions included a claim to be the Messiah. As Suetonius tells us, the whole of the East was at this time replete with Messianic expectations and men claiming to be the Messiah. Moreover, Greek philosophy, combined with the recently arrived oriental mystery-religions, had made a strange blend, producing wonder-workers and exorcists, and altogether exerting an extraordinary influence over impressionable people. The present case, therefore, stands in no way alone, nor need we suppose the Samaritans to have been unusually superstitious. The Jewish multitudes had been impressed in a similar manner by the works of Jesus and His disciples; and in the present instance Philip, Peter, and John seem to have performed signs, or miracles, too. One recalls also the excitement of the Samaritans when someone invited them to Gerizim to gaze upon the recovered vessels of Moses, an incident which ended so tragically. It was a phase through which all the East was passing, and the Samaritan susceptibility, whether more or less than that of others, was nothing out of the common. Simon's later career, whether real or legendary, does not concern us here. As Montgomery says: 'Simon Magus appears not as a type of Samaritanism, but only as an incident; doubtless there is exaggeration concerning the universality of his influence upon the Samaritans, as recorded in Acts and by Justin. . . . Further, he left behind no influence, either upon Samaritan religion or upon its historical traditions.'[1]

3. Acts ix. 31. This passage affords us merely a passing glimpse of the youthful Church in Samaria, but is nevertheless valuable. The great persecution was over, its leading spirit, Saul of Tarsus, having been converted, and we read that 'the Church through all Judea and Galilee and Samaria had peace being builded up; and walking in the fear of the Lord and in the comfort of the Holy Ghost, was multiplied.' It is a delightful interlude between the storms that preceded and those that followed. Under the new influences the general character of Jews and Samaritans was evidently very similar.

4. Acts xv. 3. This gives us another and final glimpse of the Christianized Samaritans. Paul and Barnabas, *en route*

[1] *Samaritans*, p. 268.

from Antioch to Jerusalem, 'passed through both Phoenicia and Samaria, declaring the conversion of the Gentiles: and they caused great joy unto all the brethren.' One remembers the visit which Jesus would have paid to one of these Samaritan villages, and how different the reception of the news of His approach. The atmosphere had changed for the better. The Samaritans entertain no prejudice against Gentiles. They had themselves suffered too much from this to be bigoted towards others. The doubtful attitude of the Jewish Christians of Jerusalem towards the news brought by Paul and Barnabas is in striking contrast with the joy with which it was greeted by the Samaritans. It took the Jews a long time, and required much contention, before they attained the same breadth of outlook and the same Christian spirit.

Conclusions

It is evident that the Samaritans who did become Christians were on the same level of spiritual preparedness as the Jews. Possibly we are warranted in putting it higher than this. Being unencumbered with such deep-seated religious prejudices, they received the gospel in a simpler and more natural fashion than their neighbours.

As for the Samaritans who remained unaffected by Christianity, all that we know is that they did not hinder the work of the Christian preachers or impede those of their own faith who wished to pass over to the new faith.

Chapter X

SAMARITAN LITERATURE

The extant literature of the Samaritans is very scanty, possibly, as they themselves assert, because many of their writings were destroyed during the Hadrian persecution; more probably because they were not a literary people, and never possessed literature in any considerable quantity. For the most part, what is left is neither striking nor important. To this, however, there is one illustrious exception: their Pentateuch.

I. The Pentateuch

Of its early existence evidence is found in the mention of it by early Jewish and Christian writers. Of the former, one Rabbi Elieser ben Simon [1] alludes to it with scorn: 'You have falsified your Law,' he says.[2] But the early Christian writers like Origen, Eusebius, Jerome, Cyril of Alexandria, and Georgius Syncellus treat it with great respect and even praise it. Origen gives it the name by which he knows it: τὸ τῶν Σαμαρειτῶν Ἑβραΐον, and on the margin of his Hexapla gives its 'various readings.' Syncellus[3] regards it as 'the earliest and best even by the testimony of the Jews themselves.'[4] This, however, is the last allusion to it in ancient times, and all traces of it was lost until in 1616 Pietro della Valle brought a copy of it from Damascus. This was published by Morinus in the Paris Polyglott of 1645 and by Walton in the London Polyglott of 1657, and as soon as the variations between it and the recognized Hebrew and Greek texts were observed, a great controversy arose on the subject between Roman Catholics and Protestants.

A copy of this Pentateuch, said to be very ancient, is now preserved in great secrecy in the Synagogue of Nablus. But

[1] *Circa* A.D. 160.
[2] *Circa* A.D. 800.
[3] *Jer. Sota.*, vii. 3.
[4] *Chronog.*, p. 83.

its origin is wrapped in obscurity, and it is improbable that it belongs to anything like so early a time as the Samaritans claim.

The language of the Samaritan Pentateuch is Hebrew, but it is written in a script of a much older date than that of our present Hebrew Bible. Its relationship to the Jewish Pentateuch and the Septuagint Version has been a matter of careful investigation, but the lack of a really critical edition of its text has rendered this work difficult and its results uncertain. In a large number of instances, Gesenius says over a thousand, it agrees with the Septuagint against the Massoretic text, while in a similar number of cases the Massoretic text and the Septuagint agree with each other against the Samaritan. Of the many theories which have been propounded to explain these facts none is free from objection. Quite probably the Samaritan and Septuagint texts have a different original from that on which the Massoretic text is based.

The most important differences between the Samaritan Pentateuch and the Jewish have been already noted. They relate mainly to those passages which support the Samaritan doctrines of God, and the supreme importance of Mount Gerizim.

When the Samaritans received their Pentateuch is a matter of speculation. It is usually held that when Manasseh left Jerusalem for Gerizim he took a copy of the existing Pentateuch with him, but this is questioned by some writers, who maintain that at that time the Pentateuch had not reached its present and final form. Of course this difficulty disappears if the later date of Manasseh is accepted.

Translations of the Pentateuch

(*a*) *Samaritan.* Owing to the entire disappearance of the old Hebrew language from ordinary use, it became necessary to have a Version in the common Samaritan or Aramaic tongue spoken by the people. At what time this was accomplished cannot be ascertained definitely, but judging from the resemblances between this Version and the Targum of Onkelos, it may be safely assigned to the second or third century (A.D.).

(*b*) *Greek.* A translation into Greek is mentioned by some early writers, but its existence is a matter of dispute. It seems, however, very probable that such a version was made, though the actual evidence for it is doubtful.

(*c*) *Arabic.* In the eighth century Syria was overrun by Mohammedans, and Arabic became a common language among the Samaritans. To meet the new need, Abu Sa'id in the eleventh century prepared a version in Arabic, using for this purpose the Hebrew–Samaritan Pentateuch, the Samaritan translation and an earlier version by one Saadiah made in the preceding century. A MS. preserved in the Barberini Library, known as the Barberini Triglott, contains the Hebrew–Samaritan text together with the Samaritan and Arabic translations in three columns.

After the Pentateuch and its translations, the next most important branch of Samaritan literature exists in the form of Chronicles, which may be described briefly.

II. Chronicles

(*a*) *The Book of Joshua.*—This is ostensibly a history from the time of Joshua down to the fourth century (A.D.). In reality it deals only with selected portions of this long period. It is evidently based, in part, on the Jewish history otherwise known to us, though differing from it in several respects. Legendary matter is also utilized to a considerable extent.

The work has been carefully investigated by Juynboll, who in 1848 published it from an Arabic MS. written in Samaritan characters, and his conclusions are very generally accepted. He believes that the book was composed in Egypt in the thirteenth century of our era, and that the Compiler's sources probably go back 'to the beginning of the present era and perhaps earlier.'[1]

(*b*) *The Toledoth*, or the Books of the Generations. Neubauer discovered and published this volume in 1869, accompanying it with a translation. It consists of an account of the way in which God made known to Adam the method of arranging the calendar. To this are added narratives of certain important events down to the time of the first author. The tale is taken up by various succeeding writers. The real value of the record is limited to the time immediately preceding the several writers. The book is written in Samaritan-Hebrew with an Arabic translation. The writer is said to be Eleazar ben Amram, who lived in the middle of the twelfth century

[1] *Montgomery*, op. cit., p. 305.

of our era. Jacob ben Ishmael continued it 200 years later, and others followed down to the year 1859.

(*c*) *The Chronicle of Abu'l Fath* was written by himself in 1355 in Arabic. The book is manifestly largely dependent on the two works just mentioned. It is an attempt to write the history of the Samaritans from Adam down to the eighth century (A.D.). While doubtless a sincere effort, it is marred by many 'gaps and historical blunders' which make it of no more account than the books preceding. It contains, among other matters, a full account of the periods of Divine Favour and Disfavour, together with an interesting narrative of an alleged contest before Surdi, the King (? Cyrus of Persia), between the representatives of Jews and Samaritans (Zerubbabel and Sanballat). The question fittingly enough related to the respective merits of the Jewish and Samaritan Pentateuchs, in which, naturally, the latter gained the victory.

III. Other Extant Literature

This consists mainly of commentaries on the Pentateuch and some volumes on theological subjects. In addition there is a long list of volumes of a liturgical character containing prayers and hymns. Their origin is uncertain, but in all likelihood the earliest belongs to the fourth century (A.D.). The names of Marka and Amram are usually associated as the authors, and probably the collection owes something to Baba Rabba, the religious reformer of that epoch. The present Samaritans have two collections, which they call respectively Defter (i.e. book) and Durran (i.e. string of pearls). The language varies, portions being written in good Hebrew, but the later parts are in Samaritan–Hebrew.

PART III

THE ESSENES

SYNOPSIS OF PART III

CHAPTER I

Introduction

PAGE

Peculiar interest in the Essenes—Josephus calls them a sect—Really an Order or Community—The great enigma of history—Philo—Herod 270
Penetrating influence—John the Baptist—Josephus lived among them for three years 271

CHAPTER II

Sources of Information

Philo—Josephus—Pliny—Solinus—Hippolytus—Porphyry . . . 273
Essene literature: Enoch—Assumption of Moses—4 Esdras—Sibylline Oracles—Apocalypse of Abraham 275

CHAPTER III

Name and Origin

Name: Healers 277
Silent ones 277
Outsiders 278
The Pious 278
Origin: Obscurity—Found in the middle of the second century B.C.—
From the Chasidim like the Pharisees 278
Exclusiveness essential to the purity desired—Not connected with the Therapeutae 280

CHAPTER IV

History and Manner of Life

Where they lived 282
Admission and probation 283
Organization 284
Occupation 285
Community of Goods 287
Ceremonial purity 288
Neglect of the Temple 290
Propagandists (?) 290

CHAPTER V

Beliefs

Jewish creed the basis 292
The soul and body 293
Pre-existence 294
Immortality 295
Dualism 296
Angels 297
Fate or Providence 298
Neglect of animal sacrifices 300
Alleged sun-worship 302
Foretelling events 304
Healing 304

CHAPTER VI

Non-Jewish Elements

PAGE

Point of divergence from the Jewish creed. What remains to be accounted for—Possible influences : 307
(1) Syrian nature-worship 309
(2) Buddhism 310
(3) Zoroastrianism 312
Sun-worship 313
Angelology 314
Dualism 314
The soul, its pre-existence and destiny 315
(4) Pythagoreanism 316

CHAPTER VII

Relation to Christianity and the Heresies

(1) *Origins :* Jesus Christ—John the Baptist 319
(2) *Heresies :* Gnostics—Ebionites—Elkesaites 321

Chapter I

INTRODUCTION

The history and beliefs of the Essenes have for many years excited great interest among students of Judaism and early Christianity, and still continue to exert a peculiar fascination over the mind. The Jewish historian Josephus classed them with the Pharisees and Sadducees as one of the three Jewish sects, but this is a dignity to which they cannot properly lay claim. It is well known that this historian was very desirous to write the history of his nation in the way best calculated to commend it to the favourable opinion of the Greeks; and having found parallels, as he believed, to the Stoics and Epicureans in the Pharisees and Sadducees, he rounded off his scheme by making the Essenes a school of thought and life comparable to the Pythagoreans. In this, however, he was the victim of his own patriotism, for though the word 'sect' may perhaps be applied to the Essenes in a general sense, they would be much more correctly described as an 'order' or 'community.' From their origin, probably in the middle of the second century B.C. until their disappearance soon after the Fall of Jerusalem, they took no part or interest in the life of the nation; they never became propagandists,[1] and their views were not based on any principle which distinguished them fundamentally from the vast majority of their fellow-countrymen. They held in the main, as we shall see, the great principles of Judaism, and in those respects in which they differed from others, the distinction lay rather in practice than in theory.

The late Bishop Lightfoot describes the Essenes as 'the great enigma of Hebrew history'[2]; it is true enough that the origin of some of their beliefs is very uncertain, and their final disappearance is wrapped in mystery. The same writer

[1] Though Friedländer holds that they did (*Die relig. Bewegungen*, p. 146).

[2] Lightfoot, *Com. Coloss.*, p. 80.

goes on to say: 'Admired alike by Jew, by heathen, and by Christian, he (the Essene) yet remains a dim, vague outline, on which the highest subtlety of successive critics has been employed to supply a substantial form and an adequate colour. An ascetic, mystical, dreamy recluse, he seems too far removed from the hard experience of life to be capable of realization.[1] The Elder Pliny shows us how the Essenes struck a Roman writer of the best type: 'They are a race to themselves, more remarkable than any other in the wide world.[2] Philo of Alexandria, anxious no doubt like Josephus that his countrymen should stand well with the Gentile world, points proudly to the fact that not one of the many invaders of Palestine was ever able to lay any charge against them. It is perhaps even more remarkable that the Idumean Herod, a man not too scrupulous in his treatment of people who obstructed his path, excused the Essenes from the usual oath of loyalty to himself, a favour greatly valued by a Community which repudiated all oaths as derogatory to character. Possibly, as Josephus suggests, this leniency was due to the monarch's recollection that it was a certain Essene named Menahem who had years before foretold Herod's future greatness; but even so, his concession is a striking tribute to the respect which the Order inspired in so ruthless a man.

It must be admitted that the *influence of Essenism* on the nation as a whole was probably never very great. We are informed by Philo and Josephus that their number might be reckoned at 4,000, and this was in all likelihood a maximum figure. But this is after all a small matter; their importance was intensive rather than extensive, and their influence was independent of numbers. They cannot be said to have changed laws; they produced no revolution and headed no crusade; but as a subtle, penetrating power the student meets them at many points. There are, of course, those who would find their presence almost everywhere. For instance, some would include John the Baptist among their number, a suggestion which must be considered later. But its improbability will strike every one at once. The Baptist certainly resembled the sect in that he was an ascetic in garb, food, and general habits; but in the great work of his life, viz. the preparation of the nation for the expected Messianic Kingdom, there is a fatal and

[1] Ibid., p. 80 f.

[2] *Historia Naturalis*, Bk. v. xvii.

final exception to all apparent similarities. Formerly, too, there were those who claimed Jesus as a member of the sect, but this extraordinary idea is now generally abandoned. It is, however, particularly interesting to find that Josephus, one of our chief authorities on Essenism, was himself a novice among them for about three years. The story comes from his own autobiography.[1] Having approved himself to the priests of Jerusalem, at the age of sixteen he essayed to make personal trial of the three great sects—Pharisees, Sadducees, and Essenes —to discover where the truth was to be found, and to which sect he should yield allegiance. He recounts the hardships he endured among the Essenes ; but so determined was he to gain all he could from the solitary life, that he went and joined himself to an ascetic named Banus, who lived quite alone. Solitariness was not an Essene custom, as they were cenobites on principle. Nevertheless he remained with Banus for some time, but after three years returned to Jerusalem and espoused Pharisaism. The case of Josephus is interesting not only because it shows that his testimony regarding the Essenes was based upon first-hand knowledge, but because it appears to have been typical. There was, as Pliny informs us,[2] a frequent experience of weariness of life among the men of that time, and the quietude and seclusion of the Essene encampment attracted from many quarters the disappointed and the stricken. And even though the majority of these visitors did not become actual members of the sect, but after a temporary sojourn returned to their old lives, like Josephus, the influence felt not infrequently remained.

[1] *Life*, § 2. [2] Op. cit., v. 17.

Chapter II

SOURCES OF INFORMATION

Our ' sources ' for Essenism are not by any means numerous, and some of those often cited are not of first-hand value. The Jewish writers, Philo and Josephus, are valuable in the highest degree. Pliny is almost equally good, as far as he goes, but unfortunately his account does not take us very far. Apart from two or three small volumes of uncertain Essene origin, these three are our chief authorities, and the rest are almost negligible. There are a few references in early Christian writers (e.g. Hippolytus and Epiphanius), but on examination it is easy to see that they mainly depend on the writers already named. A few notes on each are now given.

Philo was a Jew and contemporary with Essenism. He was born about 20–10 B.C., lived at Alexandria and visited Jerusalem in his youth. His chief contribution to our knowledge of the Essenes is found in his *Quod omnis probus liber*, §§ 12, 13. In recent years serious doubt has been cast on the genuineness of this work, but the reasons assigned do not appear sufficient, and as Schürer says: ' Its genuineness is . . . surpassingly probable.'[1] Another work formerly accepted as from Philo, *De vita contemplativa*, which might have been of considerable service on some points, cannot be utilized, as its genuineness is uncertain. Fortunately Eusebius has preserved in his *Praeparatio Evangelica*, viii. 11, a fragment from Philo's ἡ ὑπερ Ἰουδαίων ἀπολογία, and its genuineness is generally admitted.

Lately the whole question of the value of Philo's testimony has been canvassed by Ohle, who would leave us with merely the dimmest and vaguest outline, the remainder being regarded as accretions from unreliable sources. His drastic criticism has not so far received much acceptance, for while granting Philo's

[1] *J. P. T. J. C.*, II. iii. 349.

tendency to colour his people's history and especially to display their supposed philosophical gifts, there is no sufficient ground for doubting the general reliability of the writings named.

Josephus, like Philo, was a Jew born at Jerusalem *circa* 37 (A.D.), and lived for over sixty years. He was therefore a later contemporary of the sect. Allusions to the Essenes are found in several places in his writings. The following are the chief: *Antiquities*, XIII. v. 9, XV. x. 4, 5, XVIII. i. 2, 5; *War of the Jews*, I. iii. 5, II. viii. 2–13; *Life*, § 2. In none of these does the 'genuineness' require defence, as it is not in serious dispute. Ohle, indeed, is again opposed to any complete acceptance of Josephus's witness. But, though 'tendency' may be seen here as in the case of Philo, and we may find ourselves unable to follow Josephus *au pied de la lettre*, most critics are agreed as to his general trustworthiness.

Pliny the Elder was born in A.D. 23, and died in A.D. 79. He alludes to the Essenes in his *Historia Naturalis*, bk. v. xvii. The passage is only a short one and quite probably largely dependent on Philo and Josephus.

Solinus, who flourished about the middle of the third century of our era, mentions the Essenes in his *Polyhistor* (xxxv. 7–10), but here again there is no indication of independence of research, and he drew probably from Pliny. In any case he adds nothing to our knowledge of the subject.

Hippolytus flourished *circa* A.D. 200. In his *Refutation of all Heresies* (ix. 14–23) Josephus is evidently the chief authority for the statements made concerning the Essenes. Any additions he makes tend merely to emphasize their Jewish characteristics, and particularly the association of some of their number with the Zealots and Sicarii.

Porphyry lived *circa* A.D. 233–304. Originally he was probably a Christian, though later an opponent of Christianity. He wrote a book entitled *The Abstinence from Animal Food*, and in chap. iv. 11–13 refers to the Essenes. But he frankly admits his indebtedness to the writings of Josephus for his information.

Epiphanius, who died A.D. 403, was Bishop of Constantia, in Cyprus. He likewise wrote *Against Heresies*. In it he deals with Essenes under the name of Ossenes. While interesting from the fact that he attempts to find traces of 'Ossene'

influence on the Sampseans, an Eastern sect of Christians, his contribution makes no serious addition to our knowledge of the sect.

The *New Testament* does not mention the Essenes at all, though some writers believe that traces of their influence may be discerned in the Epistles to the Colossians, to the Romans, and by James, and in the Books of the Acts and Revelation.

The same remark may be made of *Rabbinic literature*, though an attempt is made by Edersheim to find traces of the sect in the word Chitsonim (i.e. outsiders).[1]

Essene Literature.

Our greatest misfortune is that the writings of the Essenes themselves seem to have disappeared. That they once had books of their own we know from Josephus,[2] but with two or three doubtful exceptions these no longer exist. Perhaps they never depended upon books to any great extent, for as Josephus says: 'He (i.e. the Essene) swears to communicate their doctrines to no one any otherwise than as he received them himself.'[3] There are, however, many writers in our own day who believe that traces of Essene origin may be found in certain volumes of the *Pseudepigrapha*. Wellhausen, for instance, says: 'Their secret literature was perhaps in no small degree made use of in the *Pseudepigrapha*, and has through them been indirectly handed down to us.'[4]

The Book of Enoch, which is pre-Christian in date, is very generally placed in this category. Of its later portions Ewald states that they 'breathe an Essaic spirit.'[5] Oscar Holtzman, Tideman, Cheyne, Porter, and Charles take the same view. Reference may be made especially to chaps. vi., lxix., lxxiii., xcviii., and cviii., in support of this contention. Nevertheless it is to be remarked that the *Book of Enoch* is not to be regarded as on the whole an Essene production. While in some passages it glorifies asceticism, scorns gold and silver, and suggests the dualism of light and darkness—known traits of Essenism—in other passages it equally exalts the married state and the Temple-service, to both of which Essenism was opposed.[6]

Other books suspected of being tinctured with Essenism are

[1] See *Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah*, i. 333 f. [2] *War*, II. viii. 7. [3] Ibid.
[4] Quoted by Porter in *H. D. B.*, i. 113a; *vide* also Box, *Expos.*, VIII. XXIV., p. 326.
[5] *History of Israel*, v. 371, *n.* [6] Cf. Charles, *Book of Enoch*, 2nd ed., p. 269.

The Assumption of Moses, 4 Esdras,[1] *The Sibylline Oracles*, and *The Apocalypse of Abraham*. Schmidt and Merz[2] uphold the Essene origin of the first of these books, which they believe was written soon after the Fall of Jerusalem.[3] But the prominence it gives to the national hopes and the Temple are not what we should have expected in an Essene production.

The Sibylline Oracles belong to different dates and proceed from different hands. Here and there, especially in Book iv. the presence of Essene influence may be traced. Book i., however, which appears to be pre-Christian, is entirely Jewish, and maintains animal sacrifices. This is also the case with Book iii., which is attributed to an Egyptian Jew in the middle of the second century B.C.[4] Book iv. is of later date, possibly about A.D. 80, and it is here that we come upon the supposed Essene tinge. Animal sacrifices are repudiated,[5] even the Temple is regarded as unworthy of the Almighty,[6] and among the virtues are grace before meals,[7] and lustrations,[8] both common to Essenes. But 'graces' were found among Pharisees too, and once the Jerusalem Temple was destroyed, it is conceivable that many Jews would deny the necessity of animal sacrifices—a belief that they may have cherished before, but dared not express.

The Apocalypse of Abraham is dated by Canon Box at the end of the first or beginning of the second century (A.D.). His conclusion is 'that the Book, substantially as it lies before us, is a Jewish and Essene production.'[9] The characteristics which lead to this view are the presence of predestinarianism,[10] dualism,[11] asceticism,[12] its angelology,[13] its emphasis on right and left,[14] all of them characteristics of Essenism. Taken separately none of these is decisive, but the presence of all in one small book is certainly arresting. Still, the theory of Essene origin is not free from difficulties, as Canon Box acknowledges, e.g. free-will[15] is accepted as well as its opposite, and animal sacrifices are held in esteem. This last, so directly opposed to Essene practice, is explained by attributing the Essene objection to them less to the sacrifices themselves than to the depravity of the existing priesthood.

[1] *Vide* Box, *Apoc. and Pseud.*, ii. p. 623. [2] *Die Assumptio Mosis*, 1868.
[3] R. H. Charles dates it between A.D. 7 and 30.
[4] Cf. *Apoc. and Pseud.*, ii. 375; *Sib. Or.*, i. 21, iii. 576 ff. [5] iv. 28 ff.
[6] iv. 8 ff., 28. [7] iv. 25 f. [8] iv. 165.
[9] *Apoc. of Abraham*, Intro., xxiii. [10] Chap. xxii. [11] Chap. xiii.
[12] Chap. ix. [13] Jaoel, Azazel, and *passim*. [14] Chap. xxii. [15] Chap. xxvi.

Chapter III

NAME AND ORIGIN

Name

Josephus usually calls the community Ἐσσηνοί, sometimes Ἐσσαῖοι. Pliny prefers the former title and Philo the latter. This difference is of little importance, but when we endeavour to ascertain the origin and meaning of either of these names we are faced with serious difficulties. Philo's attempted derivation from ὅσιοι (i.e. the holy ones) is so improbable that it needs only to be named to be dismissed from consideration. It is almost universally acknowledged that, whatever its meaning, the name must be of Hebrew or Syriac origin, and of the many suggestions made the following are the only ones which need give us serious concern.

1. אסיא (from אסא—to heal) means a physician. This derivation is supported by Baur, Derenbourg, Keim, and others. There can be little doubt that it owes something to the well-known propensity of the sect to act as healers, and perhaps also to a presumed relationship between the Essenes and the Therapeutae of Alexandria. In regard to the latter suggestion, it is quite improbable that the two communities were in any way connected with each other; and as for the former, history reveals no such general practice of 'healing' as justifies us in thinking that their very name would be based upon that fact.

2. חשאים (i.e. the silent ones) is supported by Lightfoot, C. Taylor, and E. Mittwoch. Here again the argument is admittedly based upon a well-known Essene characteristic, but it was only one of many, and does not appear in their teaching at all. Even at meal-time, when their comparative quietness in speech was so much commented upon, they were not actually silent. Indeed, arrangements were made for conversation, but in an orderly and non-tumultuous manner.

Still, it cannot be denied that beholders were much impressed by this feature; and as sects have often received their names from outside observers, it is possible that the Essenes became known as 'the silent ones'; though, as it appears to the present writer, such an explanation ought only to be adopted in the event of none better being discovered.

3. חיצונים (i.e. the outsiders) is a theory championed by Edersheim, but so far it has met with little or no support. The derivation is of course entirely in keeping with Edersheim's general theory of the 'outside' position which the Essenes occupied in relation to the Temple worship. The surmise is further supported by its author on the ground that the name has been preserved in all probability by Pharisees, who would not be likely to retain for opponents a title of a laudatory nature such as the one usually accepted undoubtedly is. But this does not carry us far. It is perhaps enough to say that the difficulty mentioned does not arise if the name means either 'silent ones' or 'physicians'; that the name (whatever it may mean) probably took such firm hold that even its bitterest antagonists could not disturb it; and that there is little reason to assume that the name was intended as a stigma upon a sect of whom Josephus, himself a Pharisee, writes in such commendatory terms.

4. ܚܣܝܐ or ܚܣܝܠ (חסיא from חסא), i.e. the 'pious,' is the derivation most generally received. Ewald, Hitzig, Lucius, Ermoni, Schürer, and A. Jülicher may be quoted as supporting it. The chief and sufficient argument in its favour is found in the fact that 'striving after piety' was the sect's most distinguishing characteristic. Of course, their manner of doing so was peculiar; but whatever may be thought of the method there can be no doubt that this was their fundamental aim. In all probability this interpretation will retain, as it has won, the general consensus of approval. Without claiming absolute certainty, therefore, we may take it as probable that the name 'Essenes' first meant 'the pious ones.'

Origin

Referring to the time and circumstances of the sect's origin, Schürer says: 'The origin of the Essenes is as obscure as their name.'[1] But while this may be true in regard to details, it is

[1] *J.P.T.J.C.*, II. ii. 191.

hardly correct to give the impression that we are without any guidance whatsoever. Pliny, indeed, speaks of their having existed for 'thousands of ages,' but this is only the casual remark of one who had no special interest in investigating the matter.

Mention is first made of them by Josephus as existing in the time of the Maccabean Jonathan, who reigned from 161 to 143 B.C.[1] The same writer also refers to one Judas, an Essene, in the time of Aristobulus, who ruled from 105 to 104 B.C.[2] No information exists of any Essenes earlier than this. But though scanty, the references are sufficient to enable us to fix their origin at a time not later than the middle of the second century B.C. Further, enough is known of the circumstances of this period to warrant the belief that it was actually then that the sect came into existence as a distinct community.

As is well known, from Ezra downwards, the most ardent supporters of the Jewish faith insisted upon the supreme importance of ceremonial purity. Thus it was that the Chasidim came into existence as the stern and rigid upholders of the Jewish Law, probably in the closing years of the third century B.C. And the spirit of the Chasidim was still vigorous in the reign of Jonathan. On the one hand the Sadducees stood for what they regarded as the broader and more liberal interpretation of Judaism, conceding much to the exigencies of the age; on the other hand were the two Pro-Legalist parties, the Pharisees and the Essenes, both spiritual descendants of the Chasidim. Here, then, is our problem. Why were the Legalists divided into two sections? The explanation is to be found, probably, in the conviction of a considerable section of the Legal party, that in order to secure the prevalence of their beliefs it was necessary, in addition to private and purely religious influences, to utilize to the fullest extent the governmental forces of the nation. But the old spirit of the Chasidim was opposed to this, and hence a cleavage took place—one section becoming the Pharisees, the other the Essenes.[3] Probably there was another factor, which presents a crucial illustration of the difficulties of the general position just described. This was the assumption by Jonathan of the

[1] *Ant.*, XIII. v. 9. [2] *Ant.*, XIII. xi. 2; *War*, I. iii. 5.
[3] *Vide* the remarks of F. Jackson and K. Lake, *Beg. of Christianity*, i. 88.

office of high-priest. The danger to pure religion of a union of so intimate a nature between the civil and ecclesiastical authorities, though inevitable at a time when the very existence of the Jewish State depended upon the complaisance of outsiders, must have deeply impressed those whose interests were wholly religious. Essenism was the outcome of this sense of danger to religion, an expression of the incompatibility of high-priesthood and kingship combined in one and the same person. The cleavage can hardly be termed an absolute opposition between two principles, for both aimed at ceremonial purity; rather was it based upon an opposition of method as to the way in which identical principles might best be carried into effect.[1] Henceforward the paths of the two lay apart, and, as is usual, diverged more and more as time went on. The one lived in the open and strove mightily to prepare the nation for the coming of the Messianic Age; the other turned aside from the broad highways of life, contenting itself with the saving of its own soul and the souls of those who voluntarily joined them.

Exclusiveness

An exclusive community, bent solely on the attainment of religious ideals, is a common enough feature in the East, and even in Judaism precursors of this manner of life are not entirely wanting. The Nazirites and the Rechabites, for instance, were men who separated themselves from their fellows for religio-national purposes, but beyond this general feature the contrasts between them and the Essenes were more numerous and important than the similarities. In Naziritism the spirit of asceticism indeed existed, but communism, a vital characteristic of Essenism, was lacking. So too with the Rechabites, as Morrison puts it: 'The Rechabites were nomadic in their habits, the Essenes were agriculturalists; but in some other respects there was a certain similarity between them. Both communities were ascetic, and both inhabited the same desert oasis on the western shores of the Dead Sea.'[2] Edouard Reuss derives Essenism mainly from the Ebionites, 'the poor, the humble, the oppressed,' known to us in the later Psalms for their piety and religious resignation.

[1] Cf. Keim, Kuenen, and others.

[2] *Jews under the Romans*, p. 325.

This certainly looks in the right direction, but the more positive elements in Essenism are lacking.

It has been supposed by Ewald and many others that an intimate connexion can be traced between our sect and the Therapeutae of Alexandria, but this idea is now generally abandoned, and with good reason. The Therapeutae lived in individual solitude, did no work, and did not practise ablutions —in all of which respects the Essenes differed from them. The theory of Hilgenfeld that Essenism was in its origin a new school of revelation and prophecy makes too much of one solitary characteristic. There is no evidence that the spirit of prophecy was possessed by more than a few members of the sect. Besides, this theory fails to emphasize the virtuous lives of the Essenes, which was admittedly their most distinguishing mark.[1]

[1] Cf. Keim, *Jesu of Nazara.*

Chapter IV

HISTORY AND MANNER OF LIFE

Where They Lived

There is no mention of any Essenes outside Palestine. It would appear that in the first instance they lived a semi-secluded life, mainly in the villages and small towns of the country, and perhaps only in the south. Thus Philo says: 'They reside in villages, shunning town life on account of the lawless manner of townsfolk, since they are well aware that such associations are as able to infect their souls with incurable disorder as tainted air is to infect their bodies with incurable disease.'[1] Again: 'They dwell in many cities of Judea and many villages, and in large and populous societies.'[2] The witness of Josephus is similar: 'They have no single city, but large numbers of them inhabit every city.'[3] Further proof of their residence in several places is found in the fact that whenever an Essene was on a journey he was generally able to find a fellow-Essene, whatever the town or village in which he sojourned, to give him temporary board and lodging. But they did not restrict themselves at all times to small towns. When Judas, an Essene, was bemoaning the fact that his prophecy respecting the death of Antigonos had not as yet come true he was in Jerusalem, in or near the Temple. Also the story of Simon, 'one of the sect of the Essenes,' explaining the vision of Archelaus, seems to show some connexion even with the Court. And in a description of Jerusalem in the time of Titus, Josephus alludes to an Essene 'gate' to be found in that city.[4] At any rate, in the earlier days of Essenism it seems clear that they were scattered over a good deal of the land, though probably living in each place in their own separated communities. But sooner or later the conviction was

[1] *Quod om. prob. lib.*, § 12.
[2] *War*, II. viii. 4.
[3] Quoted by Euseb., *Praep. Evang.*, viii. 11.
[4] *Ant.*, XIII. xi. 2; *War*, I. iii. 5, II. vii. 3, V. iv. 2.

forced upon them that the complete attainment of their ideal of ceremonial purity demanded a separation and seclusion even stricter and more severe than that hitherto insisted on, and they forthwith betook themselves to the western shores of the Dead Sea. Here they were far from the haunts and disturbing influences of their fellows, and it was here that their communal life attained its fullest development. On this Pliny remarks: 'On the west side (of the Dead Sea) the Essenes avoid the noxious shore-line. . . . Below them lay the town of Engedi, once second only to Jerusalem in fertility and palm-groves, now simply a second sepulchre. Then comes the rock-fort of Masada, which is not far from the Dead Sea.'[1] There is no reason to suppose that at any time the whole community gathered at Engedi, though the vast majority did so, and this place became famous hereafter as their headquarters, where their ideal of life flourished to perfection.[2]

Admission and Probation

The membership of the order was recruited from two sources: First, young children were received, maintained, and trained for future membership. 'They select other people's children, when their characters are still fresh enough to be indoctrinated, adopt them, and mould them after their own tenets.'[3] But not until they had reached manhood did the question of membership actually arise. 'There is among the Essenes no mere child, or even a scarce-bearded lad, or young man; since of such as these the moral dispositions are unstable and apt to change in accordance with their imperfect age; and they are all full-grown men, already verging upon old age, as being no longer swept away by the flood of bodily impulses, or led by their passions, but in the enjoyment of the genuine and only real liberty.'[4] But whence and how was this second and older type of recruit obtained? Pliny answers the question: 'Still their membership is steadily recruited from the large number of people who resort to their mode of existence because they are wearied of life's struggle with the waves of adversity . . . so fruitful for them is the dissatisfaction with life which others feel.'[5] It is to be noted that there is no mention here of women or girls, who were not admitted to the order.

[1] *Hist. Nat.*, v. 17.
[2] Josephus, *War*, II. viii. 2.
[3] Cf. Friedländer, op. cit., p. 120.
[4] Philo, quoted by Eus., *Praep. Ev.*, viii. 11.
[5] *Hist. Nat.*, v. 17.

The gateway of admission was very carefully guarded. The applicant had to pass through a period of three years' probation. On entering the candidate received an axe (or shovel), an apron, and a white garment—symbols and instruments of labour and purity. With the axe (or shovel) he performed his rustic tasks, with the apron he covered his nakedness while performing the required ablutions, and, arrayed in the white garment of purity, he partook of his frugal meals. For a year the probationer was regarded as an outsider, and was not admitted to any of the peculiar privileges of the Brotherhood. If at the end of this time he had proved himself worthy, he was brought a stage nearer to membership by being permitted and required to participate in the order's baths of purification. This part of the probationary period lasted for two more years. Then, after three years in all, and being still found worthy, the candidate was sworn in to full membership by a solemn and comprehensive oath. This oath is all the more striking as it was the only one which an Essene was ever allowed to take. 'What needs a divine oath to accredit it is condemned already.'[1] This initiatory oath is described by Josephus in the following terms: 'First of all to be pious to the Deity; then to practise justice towards men; never to injure any one either of his own accord or under compulsion; always to hate the wicked and to side with the just; at all times to show fidelity to all men, and particularly to those in authority, since no one acquires power apart from God; never, if he is in power himself, to vaunt his authority or to outshine his subordinates in dress or finery; always to love the truth and denounce liars; to keep his hands clean from theft and his soul from unhallowed gain; never to keep any secret from his fellow-members or to betray any of their secrets to other people—no, not even under threats of death. He swears, moreover, to communicate their principles precisely as he himself has received them, to abstain from brigandage, and to preserve with like care the sacred books of the society and the names of the angels.'[2]

Organization

The organization was strict and uniform. In all, the Brotherhood was divided into four classes, graded according

[1] *War*, II. viii. 6. [2] *War*, II. viii. 7.

to the various degrees of purity and seniority attained. How this was done we are not told, but so strict was the arrangement that if one was of a higher grade so much as touched one of a lower he thereby became polluted, and before he could regain his former position was obliged to perform certain purificatory ablutions. At the head were presidents, managers, or stewards, to whom all owed the most absolute and unhesitating obedience. These men, who were also priests, received all the earnings of the Brotherhood, gained from their various occupations, and it was part of their duty to procure with them corn and other necessaries of life.

A tribunal of not less than one hundred dealt with any charges against the character and conduct of members of the sect, and from their decision there was no appeal. Any one found guilty of heinous sins was ruthlessly expelled, and this generally resulted in death. For, though no longer an Essene, the old paths and habits generally retained their sway over him, and in accordance with the rule of the Brotherhood he would not eat food prepared by outsiders. Often the starving man, being found in extremity, would be taken back, only to die.

Trading was prohibited, because of the danger of covetous gain : nor was there any hoarding of silver, gold, or territory, beyond what the absolute necessities of life required. No weapons of war were made, or possessed, though Josephus tells us of one of their number, John, who took an active part in the great war against the Romans.[1] To this may be added the statement of Hippolytus that some Essenes joined the party of the Zealots and Sicarii. But these may reasonably be taken as quite exceptional to the normal non-warlike character of the sect and occurred at a time of extraordinary upheaval.

Occupation

It would be a total mistake to imagine that the members of this strange sect were pale-faced, sickly looking hermits whose time was spent studiously indoors, as was the habit of their alleged confrères, the Therapeutae, in Egypt. On the contrary, the ordinary day was a round of methodically arranged activities passed mainly in physical labour of one kind or another. ' Different members have different occupations, to which they strenuously devote themselves, and toil on with

[1] *War*, II. xx. 4, III. ii. 1.

unwearied patience, making no excuses of cold or heat or any change of weather; before the sun is up they turn to their usual employments, and hardly give up at its setting, delighting in work no less than those who are being trained in gymnastic contests. For, whatever occupation they follow, they imagine that these exercises are more beneficial to life, and more pleasant to soul and body, and more permanent than athletics, because they do not become unseasonable as the vigour of the body declines. Some of them labour in the fields, being skilled in matters relating to sowing and tillage; and others are herdsmen, being masters of all kinds of cattle; and others attend to swarms of bees. Others, again, are craftsmen in various arts, who, in order to avoid any of the sufferings which the want of the necessaries of life imposes, reject none of the innocent ways of gaining a livelihood,'[1] Their day began early. Having offered prayers until the sun rose, each man went forth to his appointed labour until the fifth hour of the day (i.e. 11 a.m.). He then returned, took a bath in cold water, put on his white garment and proceeded to the place of the common meal, from which all strangers were excluded. 'They enter the dining-room pure as they would enter a sacred precinct, and take their seats quietly.' The meal was very simple: 'The baker puts loaves before them in order, while the cook sets before each a plate containing one kind of food.'[2] It is asserted by some writers (from Jerome downwards) that the Essenes abstained from meat and wine, but of this no sufficient evidence is forthcoming. The conclusion has no doubt been reached by comparing the Essenes with orders of a kindred type, but it is not warranted on the evidence available. Yet there is nothing inherently improbable in the supposition, as it would be quite in keeping with the general simplicity and abstemiousness of their lives. Before and after the meal prayer was offered by the priest. The meal being over, the white garments laid aside and working attire resumed, they returned to their labours until the evening. Before the evening meal ablutions were again performed, and the white garments put on once more. This meal was freer than that at noon and strangers were admitted. Conversation was permitted, but an extraordinary solemnity and orderliness marked

[1] Philo, quoted by Eus., *Praep. Ev.*, viii. 11.
[2] Josephus, *War*, II. viii. 5.

the entire proceedings. 'No brawling or uproar ever defiles their house; they let every one speak in turn. To outsiders, indeed, the silence of the inmates seems full of awe and mystery, but it is due to their unbroken sobriety, and to the fact that food and drink are measured out for them to satisfy their needs, and no more.'[1]

As might be supposed, the seventh day was separated from all the other days for strictly religious purposes. No work might be done, nor even a fire lighted or food prepared. No vessel might be moved out of its place; even the natural functions of the body had to be intermitted on this day. They 'repair to sacred places called synagogues, where they sit arranged according to age—the young below the older persons—and listen with due order and attention. One reads aloud the sacred books, whereupon another of their most experienced members comes forward and explains whatever is not clear; for the greater part of their lore is conveyed figuratively, after their time-honoured fashion. They are taught piety, holiness, justice, the management of affairs, citizenship, the knowledge of what is truly good or bad or indifferent, how to choose the right and shun the contrary; and in all this they employ three rules and standards, viz. the love of God, the love of virtue, and the love of man.'[2]

Community of Goods

One of the most remarkable features of this system was its complete communism in regard to property. It would indeed tax the most enthusiastic communist of our day to discover any defect or failure either in its spirit or practice. On admission each candidate handed over all he possessed to one of the appointed stewards. Ever afterward he was without personal possessions of any kind. He had no house of his own, even the garments he wore were not his personal property and might be used in common. The daily earnings of the brothers went into the common fund, of which the stewards had charge. If on a journey Essenes had no need to carry money, which they eschewed, their wants being supplied by the hospitality of some members of the sect who happened to be resident in the towns or villages through which they might be passing.

[1] Josephus, *War*, II. viii. 5. [2] Philo, *Quod om. prob. lib.*, 12.

Opposed as they were to trading, no commercial transactions took place within the order. A system of free interchange was substituted, and each was able to obtain from one or other of his fellows whatsoever he had need of. The aged and sick were not neglected because of their inability to aid themselves. Special arrangements were made so that none lacked anything. In regard to outsiders charity was encouraged. Every brother was given a free hand to render assistance in all deserving cases, and especially to supply a starving man with food. In entire harmony with the spirit of communism slavery was absolutely prohibited. The love of luxury and self-indulgence being absent, no inducement to such a practice existed. But they went further: 'They condemn the position of master, not only as unjust, being a breach of equality, but as impious, since it violates the order of Mother Nature, which gives birth to all alike and rears them as genuine brothers, not as nominal, whereas crafty covetousness disorganizes this natural kinship by its desire to outshine others, it engenders hostility instead of affection, and enmity instead of friendship.'[1]

Ceremonial Purity

The whole endeavour of Essenism was directed to the attainment of the ideal of ceremonial purity, and this inevitably led to a pronounced asceticism. Not only were they resolutely opposed to all forms of gross sensuality, but even innocent pleasures of the senses were held in contempt and treated as foes to virtue. Their meals, as has been shown, were of the slightest in quantity and of the simplest in quality. Perhaps a passage in the Fragment of the Book of Noah may be regarded as referring to these practices: '. . . the spirits of the humble and of those that have afflicted their bodies and been recompensed by God . . . who love God and loved neither gold nor silver nor any of the good things which are in the world, but gave up their bodies to torture. Who, since they came into being, longed not after earthly food, but regarded everything as a passing breath, and lived accordingly.'[2] Their food had to be prepared by their own priests; no others were pure enough. Their clothing, which in winter consisted of a thick cloak and in summer of a cheap tunic, was never discarded

[1] Philo, *Quod om. prob. lib.*, § 12. [2] Enoch cviii. 7 ff.

until quite worn out. Anointing with oil, an ordinary and almost necessary practice under an Eastern sun, was repudiated as a sensual luxury. In fact, if any one by mere chance became smeared with that liquid, he was considered unclean until he could free himself from the taint by ceremonial ablutions. The frequent practice of lustrations has already been referred to as the chief means of attaining ceremonial purity. The danger of the loss of this purity was always in mind. With this in view, even ablutions themselves were performed with an apron bound around the loins, lest purity of thought should be endangered. For the same reason the functions of nature had to be carried out with the greatest secrecy so as to screen them from others and from the light of day. Friedländer[1] is disposed to minimize the importance of these purifications. He points out (1) that Philo and Pliny do not mention them, and (2) that probationers of the first year were not enjoined to perform them. But in regard to his first ground of objection, it is to be observed that ablutions occupy a very prominent place in the account of Josephus, who had lived among the Essenes, and could hardly be mistaken therefore as to a practice which he witnessed daily. Friedländer's second point only throws into relief the high position which these rites held in the estimation of the sect. Ablutions were most intimately connected with the attainment of the purity the Essenes sought: they were required before eating, after performing natural functions, after contact with a non-Essene or one of a lower order, and after accidental or intentional anointing with oil. It is difficult, therefore, to see how one can be in danger of exaggerating their importance. The white garments they wore also symbolized physical purity. They were made of linen rather than wool, probably because the former was obtained from a vegetable substance, whereas the latter came from the bodies of animals. 'Marriage they despise,' i.e. most Essenes did so. It was believed to entail physical impurity. Others who married did so only for the sake of the continuance of the race, and even they placed their wives on a probation of three years. Women were generally held in contempt, and family life considered inimical to the true spirit of communism. One curious custom, the meaning of which it is difficult to unravel, was to refrain from spitting in front or on the right hand. Probably

[1] Op. cit., pp. 117 ff., 120.

this had its origin in some ancient religious superstition, but what this was precisely we have no means of knowing.[1]

Nothing more clearly indicates the severely practical character of the Essenes than their relation to learning, which, as a whole, they despised. Apparently their religious books, whether few or many, were used solely to aid them in the practice of life. Knowledge or speculation, as such, made no appeal to them. As Philo informs us: 'Logic is a department of philosophy which they leave to word-catchers, as unnecessary for the acquisition of virtue; physical science they regard as too lofty for human nature, and so they leave that to high-flying theorists (or astrological babblers), excepting that part of it which treats of the existence of God and the origin of the Universe. It is Ethics to which they devote all their strength, under the guidance of their ancestral laws, which no human soul could have devised apart from Divine inspiration. In these laws they are instructed particularly on the seventh day, as well as at other times.'[2] Whatever criticism may be offered concerning the narrowness of this régime, its disciplinary effect upon the Essene character cannot be gainsaid. In matters of pain and death they were Stoics in endurance and fortitude. Especially in the Roman war was this shown, when, rather than break their oaths or transgress their rules of life, they willingly suffered torture and death, making no complaint.

Neglect of the Temple

Perhaps their most unexpected characteristic has yet to be named. Being Jews, it was certainly an extraordinary thing that they should neglect the Temple and its services so completely. The usual animal sacrifices imposed upon and scrupulously offered by every Jew they abstained from offering, though it is true gifts of another kind were sent. Moreover, so far as our information goes, they seem never to have attended the Temple services. We must return to this later in an endeavour to understand its significance, and if possible discover its underlying reason.

Propagandists?

Were the Essenes propagandists? Friedländer,[3] who

[1] *Vide* the reference to this in Box's edition of the *Apoc. of Abraham*, pp. xix. and 69.
[2] *Quod om. prob. lib.*, § 12.
[3] Op. cit., p. 145 f.

regards them throughout as the successors of the 'Wise,' believes that they were. For what reason, he asks, would they travel from place to place, if not for purposes of propagandism? Lipsius[1] denies this, and, as it appears to us, with sufficient reason. The former writer's supposition is a hypothesis for which he cannot produce any real evidence. Had the Essenes been propagandists Josephus and Philo could hardly have failed to mention it. And, further, there is the strange silence of John the Baptist and Jesus to be accounted for. It is scarcely to be believed that, if the Essenes had been missionaries of their faith, neither of these teachers would have encountered them at one time or another. Still less is it credible that if they had so encountered them they would have failed to refer to their neglect or oversight of the promised Messianic Kingdom. Only on the theory of Essene silence can we account for the silence of Jesus in regard to a body of men whose method of attaining purity was so antagonistic to His own. And this carries with it the conclusion that, though always willing to receive suitable accessions, they did not go out to seek them.

[1] Art. 'Essäier,' Schenkel's *Bibel-Lexicon*.

Chapter V

BELIEFS

Jewish Creed the Basis

The basis of the Essene creed, as nearly all students admit, was essentially Jewish. There were, as we shall see, deviations from it, but in the main the Essenes were distinguished from others by an unusually strong inclination towards purity and their peculiar methods of attaining it.

This being so, the only points which need special consideration are those in which they diverged from this fundamental creed, or maintained it with such devotion or intensity as amounted to distinctiveness. They revered the Law, and scrupulously obeyed its precepts in all matters except those which concerned the Temple and Sacrifice. Moses, the great Law-giver, was held by them, as by the Samaritans, in the highest reverence, and to blaspheme him meant death to the transgressor. The sacred Jewish Scriptures were read with, so far as we know, no exception. And though in their expositions they favoured the allegorical method of interpretation, they were not alone in this respect. Their own special literature has already been alluded to.[1] The Sabbath offered special opportunity for instruction in their tenets, and this teaching dealt with virtues and duties of an individual and social character. These included love of God, virtue, and duty to men. In regard to God, they insisted on the cultivation of purity, abstinence from oaths, and falsehood. God was regarded as the cause of good, but not of evil. Towards men they were taught to show good-will, impartiality, and the spirit of comradeship. The chief virtues inculcated were self-control, endurance, contentment, simplicity, good-humour, modesty, regard for the Laws and firmness of character; and special emphasis was laid on avoiding the love of money, fame, and pleasure.

[1] In chap. II.

The Soul and Body

Their doctrine of the soul and its relation to the body is stated at some length by Josephus, and the passage is so important that it should be read in full:

> '. . . They scornfully laughed at the tortures, and cheerfully gave up their souls, to receive them once again. For it is their firm opinion that, while the body is corruptible, and its substance transient, the soul is permanent and immortal; that the soul comes from the thinnest air by a sort of natural spell to be imprisoned, as it were, within the body; and that, on being released from the fetters of the flesh, it joyfully soars away into freedom from the long bondage. They believe, like the sons of the Greeks, that good souls dwell beyond the ocean, in a land never molested by rain or snow or oppressive heat, but refreshed by the gentle breath of the west wind blowing steadily from the ocean; to bad souls they allot a gloomy, stormy den, full of never-ending torments . . . which is built on this first supposition, that souls are immortal, and secondly, that people may be dissuaded from vice and prompted to virtue. For good men are made better in the conduct of their life by the hope of reward after their death, while the impulses of the vicious are restrained by the dread anticipation of suffering everlasting punishment after their death, even though they lie concealed in this life. This is the Essene doctrine of the soul, and it exercises an irresistible fascination over those who have once tasted their philosophy.'[1]

The ideas contained in this passage may be arranged as follows: the soul is immortal, but not the body; the soul had an existence before entrance upon earthly life; at the end of the present life, the good will be rewarded with perpetual comfort and joy, and the evil suffer unending torment; not only is no resurrection predicted for the body, but it is to be regarded as the foe of the soul during its earthly sojourn—a sort of prison-house from which it is glad to escape. Pre-existence, immortality, rewards for the good and punishments for the evil in the future state, together with the inherent evil resident in matter—such are the doctrines here taught.

These tenets must now be examined more carefully.

[1] *War*, II. viii. 10, 11.

PRE-EXISTENCE

This tenet cannot be traced in the Old Testament with anything approaching certainty, though some writers think it is to be found in such passages as Job i. 21, and Psalm cxxxix. 13–15. But there is no doubt of its presence in the uncanonical literature of the Essene period. In the Wisdom of Solomon (written *circa* 50–1 B.C. by an Alexandrian Jew) we read:

> 'Now I was a child good by nature and a good soul
> fell to my lot;
> Nay rather, being good, I came into a body undefiled.'[1]

Whether the writer means self-conscious existence is uncertain, though goodness without this would be somewhat meaningless.[2] It may be pointed out that the suggestion here of predestination is frequently associated with pre-existence.

Again, in the *Secrets of Enoch* (Alexandrian origin, date A.D. 1–50), we read:

> 'For all souls are prepared to eternity, before the foundation of the world';[3]

also, in the *Assumption of Moses* (of Pharisaic origin, *circa* A.D. 7–30):

> 'Accordingly He devised me (Moses), and He prepared me before the foundation of the world, that I should be the mediator of His covenant.'[4]

To these may be added a passage from 4 Maccabees (probably also of Alexandrian origin between 63 B.C. and A.D. 38):

> 'But the sons of Abraham, with their victorious mother, are gathered together unto the place of their ancestors, having received pure and immortal souls from God.'[5]

It will not escape notice that three of these quotations are taken from writings of Alexandrian origin, and it is quite in keeping with this that we find the same doctrine held by Philo, which Drummond summarizes thus:

> 'The whole company of souls was arranged in two ranks;

[1] viii. 19.
[2] Cf. Holmes, *Apoc. and Pseud.*, i. 531.
[3] xxiii. 5.
[4] i. 14.
[5] xviii. 23.

some making their descent into mortal bodies, and being released from them again in conformity with certain defined periods; the others, who enjoyed a more divine constitution and were endowed with greater and more divine thoughts, neglecting the whole region of earth and keeping aloft close to the ether itself.'[1]

Philo adds to this the idea of predestination, common among Alexandrian Jews of his time: 'Some there are whom even before birth God moulds kindly and disposes well, and chooses for them a goodly lot.'[2]

Pre-existence is not taught in the New Testament, but it is referred to in the incident of the 'man born blind,' where the disciples ask Jesus: 'Who did sin, this man or his parents, that he should be born blind?'[3] Belief in pre-natal existence is evidently held by the questioners. And that they were not alone in this belief is shown by the retort of the Pharisees when angered by the healed man's stolid support of his healer: 'Thou wast altogether born in sins, and dost thou teach us?'[4]

Immortality

That the doctrine of the immortality of the soul, together with the resurrection of the body, was held in the Essene period is well known. It is maintained in various forms in such Books as Daniel[5] and Ethiopic Enoch.[6] The Essenes themselves did not go beyond a belief in immortality. In this attitude they were sustained mainly by writers under the influence of Alexandrian thought, and from these some illustrations may be taken.

'But the souls of the righteous are in the hand of God,
And no torment shall touch them.
In the eyes of fools they seemed to die;
And their departure was accounted punishment,
And their going from us ruin:
But they are at peace.
For though in the sight of men they be punished,
Yet is their hope full of immortality.'[7]

. . . . . .

'But the righteous live for ever,' &c.[8]

. . . . . .

[1] Drummond, *Philo Judaeus*, i. 336.
[2] *Leg. All.*, iii. 28.
[3] John ix. 2.
[4] John ix. 34.
[5] xii. 1–3.
[6] Chaps. lxxxiii–xc., xci–civ.
[7] Wisd. of Sol. iii. 1–4.
[8] Wisd. of Sol. v. 15.

> 'For we through this our evil treatment and our endurance of it shall win the prize of virtue; but thou for our cruel murder shalt suffer at the hands of divine justice sufficient torment by fire for ever.'[1]

Alongside these we may place similar words from Philo:

> 'The wise man who appears to have departed from this mortal life lives in a life immortal.'[2]

The belief of the Essenes in this particular affords an excellent opportunity of comparison with the other two great sects. The Sadducees were opposed to the resurrection of the body, and held even the immortality of the soul somewhat tepidly; the Pharisees were firmly convinced of both; the Essenes, as we have seen, maintained the latter while rejecting the former, and it is useful to note that those who took the same view were the Jews of the Diaspora in Alexandria.

Dualism.

Greek philosophers were obsessed with the idea of the necessary evil of matter, and never entirely freed themselves from it. In later days they were followed in this respect by the Gnostics. It is not difficult to see that the Jewish philosopher Philo was a pupil in the same school, e.g. he says: 'Nothing presents such a hindrance to the growth of the soul as the flesh. . . . Souls that bear the burden of the flesh are weighed down and oppressed till they cannot look up at the heavens, and have their heads forcibly dragged downwards, being rooted to the earth like cattle.'[3] He calls the body 'a prison,'[4] and a 'corpse.'[5] This is the genuine product of Alexandrian thought.

On the other hand, the pure Jewish conception was in striking contrast. According to it God is the author of the soul of man and of the material universe, including, of course, the human body.

Somewhere between these two extremes stands the writer of the Wisdom of Solomon. In one passage the idea of dualism is evidently in his mind, but he directly opposes it:

[1] 4 Macc. ix. 8 f. [2] *Quod det. pot.*, § 15. [3] *De Gig.*, 7.
[4] *Migr.*, 2. [5] *Agr.*, 5.

'For He (God) created all things that they might have being:
And the generative powers (or products) of the world are healthsome,
And there is no poison of destruction in them:
Nor hath Hades royal dominion upon earth.'[1]

But elsewhere he approaches much more nearly to the language used in Josephus's description of the Essenes:

'For a corruptible body weigheth down the soul,
And the earthy frame lieth heavy on a mind that is full of cares.'[2]

By some this latter passage is regarded as conceding everything to dualism, but the earlier quotation should safeguard the author from such a misinterpretation of his meaning.

Probably the idea of the Essenes was not very different from that of the Wisdom of Solomon. Matter in general and the body in particular were hindrances to the life of the soul; it is 'imprisoned . . . within the body,' and 'on being released from the fetters of the flesh, it joyfully soars away into freedom from the long bondage'; it had to be watched, disciplined, and 'kept under.' But the life of purity, if difficult, is nevertheless looked upon as quite possible. The Apostle Paul is a writer who would scarcely be accused of being dualistic, yet he too is mindful of the dangers to the soul proceeding from its lifelong companion, the body: 'I buffet my body and bring it into bondage: lest by any means, after that I have preached to others, I myself should be rejected'; and again, 'We that are in this tabernacle (or bodily frame) do groan, being burdened.'[3]

We may therefore conclude with reasonable certainty that Essenism, with its sharp Jewish distinctions of 'clean' and 'unclean,' 'pure' and 'impure,' had been greatly influenced by the dualistic ideas of the time, but we are not warranted in declaring it to be pure dualism on the scanty and perhaps 'tendency-evidence' of Josephus.

ANGELS.[4]

It was laid upon every candidate at his admission to membership of the order that he should 'preserve . . . the names of the angels.'[5]

[1] i. 14. [2] ix. 15. [3] 1 Cor. ix. 26; 2 Cor. v. 4.
[4] *Vide* above, pt. i. chap. vi. for further reference. [5] Josephus, *War*, II. viii. 7.

In post-exilic times Jewish thought on this subject shows a very marked advance on what was held previous to the Exile. In the later period angels formed a celestial hierarchy and were ranged in higher and lower orders with archangels at the head. This development is to be attributed in all probability very largely to their contact with Zoroastrianism in Babylon. And perhaps to this may be added a growing sense of the awfulness and distance of the Deity, and the consequent need for the interposition of intermediaries, a belief which their new feeling of the dangerousness of material things sufficiently attests. Each nation had its angel-prince, and the chiefs of the angelic band formed the council of the Most High. According to Tobit,[1] there were 'seven angels which stand and enter before the glory of the Lord.'[2] Of these the names of six are well known: Gabriel,[3] Michael,[4] Raphael,[5] Uriel,[6] Jeremiel,[7] and Phaltiel,[8] Enoch[9] mentions in addition Raguel, Saraqael, and Remiel; and as the idea became familiar doubtless the number grew.

The Essene position was probably in accord with this general attitude, and it was in all likelihood a list such as this which they were required to preserve.

Fate or Providence[10]

The question of the relation of the Divine Omnipotence to human freedom had occupied the attention of Old Testament writers from early times. Two ideas, apparently contradictory, held sway. Ultimately God was believed to have all power; all acts, even sinful ones, were His doing.[11] On the other hand, men were praiseworthy or blameworthy according to their conduct, and consequently responsible for it—i.e. Divine fore-ordination and human freedom were maintained conjointly.

In the literature of the Essene period these ideas were prevalent, and it is evident from the strong antagonism of some writers that determinism was held in some well-recognized

[1] *Circa* 225–200 B.C. [2] xii. 15. [3] Dan. viii. 16, ix. 21; 1 Enoch ix. 1, &c.
[4] Dan. x. 13, 21, xii. 1; Baruch vi. 7. [5] Tobit iii. 17, xii. 15.
[6] 2 (4) Esdras iv. 1. [7] 2 (4) Esdras iv. 36.
[8] 2 (4) Esdras v. 16. [9] xx.
[10] *Vide* also Pt. I. chap. vi. for fuller statement.
[11] Cf. 2 Sam. xxiv. 1; Jerem. vi. 21; Ezek. iii. 20.

quarters. 'Ben Sirach,' for instance, has a section on the subject.[1] Obviously the writer is opposing some who would make God the cause of evil, and it is not improbable that they were in other respects men of his own faith.

In his descriptions of the three great sects, Josephus tells us that on this subject each held a view different from that of the others. The Pharisees believed in a measure of determinism, but allowed much to the will of man. The Sadducees were extremists, and 'remove Fate entirely, and suppose that God is not concerned in our doing or not doing what is evil.'[2] The Essenes went to the other extreme, holding that everything was due to Fate, man being powerless to resist it. Here we may recall the exact language of Josephus: 'But the sect of the Essenes affirm that Fate governs all things, and that nothing befalls men but what is according to its determination and will.'[3] In another place he says: 'The doctrine of the Essenes is this: that he loves to abandon everything to God.'[4] This may appear at first an instance of unadulterated determinism, and as such probably Josephus intends it to be taken. But were it actually so, it would be in singular contradiction with the whole life and history of Essenism. Why all their stringent discipline, their elaborate regulations from first to last, their expulsion of offending members, if Fate alone decides everything human? Of course one might have recourse to an alleged inconsistency on the part of the Essenes themselves, but may not the fault be with our informant? It is surely just here where the perfect accuracy of Josephus becomes suspect. Having represented the Sadducees as extremists on the side of absolute freedom, and his own sect, the Pharisees, as combining a measure of this attitude with something of the belief in the over-ruling power of God, what so tempting as to find in the rigid Essenes the other extreme, so that he might make the cycle complete? Thus would he be able to offer to his Greek readers a development of thought among his own people equal in breadth and variety to anything they themselves could boast of! But in sober fact there is nothing to be found in the history of the Essenes to justify so extreme a view. In all likelihood they were a little inconsistent, as

[1] Cf. Ecclus. xv. 11–20. Quotations are given in Pt. I. vi.
[2] Cf. *War*, II. viii. 14; *Ant.*, XIII. v. 9, XVIII. i. 3.
[3] *Ant.*, XIII. v. 9.
[4] Ibid., XVIII. i. 5.

many others have been, in endeavouring to express themselves on so complicated a subject; and that their particular emphasis was laid on the over-ruling Providence of God is quite in keeping with what we should expect from the influences of their secluded life.

The Apocalypse of Abraham, which, as already pointed out, is supposed to be a product of Essenism, illustrates this inconsistency. In one passage where God is the speaker we read: 'This is My will with regard to those who exist in the (divine) world-counsel, and it seemed well-pleasing before My sight, and then afterwards I gave commandment to them through My Word. And it came to pass whatever I had determined to be was already planned beforehand in this (picture), and it stood before me ere it was created, as thou hast seen.'[1] Yet later on we also read (God again speaking): 'Hear, Abraham. As the counsel of thy father is in him, and as thy counsel is in thee, so also is the counsel of My will in Me ready for the coming days, before thou hast knowledge of these, or (canst) see with thine eyes what is future in them. How those of thy seed will be, look in the picture.'[2]

Neglect of Animal Sacrifices

In examining this much-disputed matter it is better to have the words of Josephus before us at the outset. 'Although they send consecrated gifts to the Temple, yet they never offer sacrifices, because they have purer lustrations of their own; on which account they are excluded from the common court of the Temple, but offer their sacrifices by themselves.'[3] Philo also refers to the question, though only briefly: 'They do not sacrifice animals, but study to keep their minds in a saintly frame.'[4] It thus appears that the Essenes, for some reason, did not conform to the invariable Jewish practice of offering animal sacrifices at the Temple; they did, however, send gifts, seemingly of a non-animal type; the effect of their neglect was their exclusion from the Temple Court; and they offered some kind of sacrifice themselves. Many and various explanations of these facts have been offered. For example: (1) that they objected altogether to slaughter, and for this reason refused not only to offer animal sacrifice but even to use

[1] Chap. xxii.
[2] Chap. xxvi.
[3] *Ant.*, XVIII. i. 5.
[4] *Quod om. prob. lib.*, § 12.

animal food; (2) that the Essene regarded his daily meals as superior sacrifices of themselves; (3) that their objection was really to the existing priesthood, whom they believed to be profane and non-Levitical; (4) that they were greatly influenced by the ancient prophets who frequently disparaged, sacrifices and upheld the superior value of an obedient and righteous life.[1] The first explanation is maintained by Lightfoot,[2] but its weakness lies in the fact that both the assertions it contains are mere suppositions for which no adequate proof is produced. Moreover, it is by no means certain, as Lightfoot supposes, that those who disturbed the Christian Church at Colossae were of Essene origin; consequently one cannot argue that because the troublers of the Colossians abstained from eating flesh we are justified in making the same affirmation of the Essenes.

Where no certainty can be found we are left, of course, to conjecture, but this should be based on and checked by such facts as are not in dispute. Now we know that the Essenes had priests of their own, and it seems impossible therefore that they could be opposed to a priesthood as such, though they might conceivably object to the priests then in power at Jerusalem. Again, they lived solitary lives in the interests of their 'striving after purity'—their one concern. But had they been obliged to go up to Jerusalem from time to time to offer sacrifices, it would have involved them in hurtful contact with the great non-Essene, and therefore unclean, crowds which gathered there. And this would have brought upon them all the humiliation and sadness of ceremonial uncleanness, requiring lustrations to restore their purity. Inevitably, then, there would grow up an increasing disposition to abandon this practice. But by sending their gifts to the Temple they would be at once saved from any personal impurity, and at the same time acknowledge their unity with their fellow-countrymen.

Further, the higher priesthood of the time was without doubt worldly and, from the Essene point of view, impure. Though representatives of Jehovah, they indulged in political intrigue, lived in courtly luxury, and on many distinctly religious matters were widely separated from our sect. Lucius,[3] with others, takes up the point referred to above, viz. that their action was

[1] Cf. *Sib. Or.*, iv. 28 f.
[2] *Com. on Coloss. and Phil.*, p. 369.
[3] *Der Essenismus*, p. 75 f.

due to dislike of the priesthood as profane and non-Levitical. But the latter remark is considerably discounted by the fact that the Essenes themselves are nowhere spoken of as exercising any special care to secure Levitical descent in the case of their own priests. And such an apparent contradiction could hardly have escaped notice. To restrict ourselves therefore to the character of the existing priesthood seems to place us on safer ground. And we need not go farther than this in explaining the conduct of men whose whole life was a sustained quest for the most rigid purity. Kohler, a Jewish writer, holds this opinion. It was the priesthood to which the Essenes objected, 'out of mistrust as to their state of holiness and purity, rather than out of aversion to sacrifice.'[1] Uncleanness in the priesthood would forbid all such contact with them as the offering of animal sacrifices would imply. And with such sentiments as they entertained, it would be easy enough to find support in the denunciations of the Old Testament prophets, whose contempt for sacrifices has been mentioned.

From this position to a belief in the superiority of their own lustrations and the peculiar sanctity of their common meals is but a short and comprehensible step. Moreover, once the sect had broken with the practice of animal sacrifices, their whole thought and manner of life would tend to make the discontinuance final. Men who feared the pollution of matter would find it easy to disbelieve in the purifying efficacy of anything so gross as the blood of animals, and would tend naturally to rely altogether on the sacrifices of the spirit.

Alleged Sun-Worship

A brief and extremely uncertain reference by Josephus to the practice of offering prayers before sunrise has led many to make deductions which seem to go much beyond the evidence available. The words of Josephus are: 'Yet they are peculiarly scrupulous in matters of piety. Before sunrise they never speak a word about profane affairs, but offer some of the prayers transmitted by their forefathers, as if they besought (ὥσπερ ἱκετεύοντες) the sun to rise.'[2] Another reference to their attitude towards the sun may be placed alongside this. It occurs in the same writer's description of

[1] *Jewish Ency.*, v. 230.

[2] *War*, II. viii. 5.

their extreme modesty in performing natural functions. In so acting, they 'cover themselves with a cloak to avoid offending the rays of God,' &c.[1] Upon these two statements Lightfoot and others base the belief that the Essenes were worshippers of the sun. In confirmation of this, Lightfoot[2] quotes Epiphanius's allusion to the sun-worshipping Sampseans who lived on the shores of the Dead Sea at a later time. But this interpretation seems to push to an unwarranted extreme words which are quite capable of another and less harsh explanation. As Lightfoot himself remarks, such a practice would be very repugnant to Jewish orthodoxy,[3] and, a probability which this writer does not mention, could not have failed to bring down upon them the most outspoken denunciations of their fellow-Jews. The reference to the Therapeutae in the pseudo *De vita contemplativa* which Lightfoot quotes, does not show even by analogy that the Essenes were sun-worshippers. Of this Egyptian community it is stated that they 'stand with their faces and their whole body towards the east, and when they see that the sun is risen, holding out their hands to heaven they pray for a happy day, and for truth and keen vision of reason.'[4] Reverence is manifest here, but there is no need to assume worship. In the Wisdom of Solomon a similar practice appears:

> 'That it might be known that it is needful to anticipate the sun for giving thanks to Thee, and supplicate Thee at the dawning of it.'[5]

With this may be compared the daily prayer of the Jews which, in accordance with the teaching of the Mishnah, had to be offered as soon as the sun's rays lighted up the tops of the mountains. That such a habit is always liable to misinterpretation is evident from a passage in Tertullian in which he says: 'Others . . . believe that the sun is our God. We shall be counted Persians, perhaps, though we do not worship the orb of day painted on a piece of linen cloth, having himself everywhere in his own disc. The idea has no doubt originated from our being known to turn to the east in prayer.'[6] The Essene practice certainly seems to imply

[1] *War*, II. viii. 9. [2] *Com. Coloss. and Phil.*, p. 372 f.
[3] Cf. Ezek. viii. 16. [4] *De vit. contemp.*, iii. 11. [5] xvi. 28. [6] *Apol.*, xvi.

invocatio, but stops short of *adoratio*.[1] Had they been idolaters, Josephus, a sincere Jew, could hardly have remained among them for three years, or written of them later without condemnation of their idolatry. And it is equally unlikely that a protest against such an idolatrous act would have been wanting either from the lips of John the Baptizer or Jesus, had a professed Jewish sect been guilty of it. But though the idea of actual worship of the sun may thus, as we think, be ruled out as unproven and incredible, there yet remains the curious regard which was unquestionably paid to it, a point which will come up for consideration in our next chapter.

Foretelling Events and Healing

Of the former Josephus tells us much. First, there is his general reference to their possession of this strange power: 'There are also those among them who undertake to foretell things to come, by reading the holy books, and using several sorts of purifications, and being perpetually conversant in the discourses of the prophets; and it is but seldom that they miss in their predictions.'[2] Elsewhere he gives three notable instances of this:

1. There was one Judas who 'was of the sect of the Essenes,' and who 'had never erred or been deceived in his predictions before.' On one occasion he foretold the death of the King Aristobulus[3] at a certain time and place. And when the event appeared to have been delayed beyond the expected time Judas cried out 'to his companions and friends, who dwelt with him as his scholars in the art of foretelling things to come,' that he would prefer to die if his words were falsified by the event. Presently, however, news was brought of the fated monarch's decease.[4]

2. Menahem, 'one of these Essenes . . . once saw Herod when he was a child, and going to school, and saluted him as King of the Jews.'[5] The boy became known afterwards as Herod the Great, and, remembering Menahem on his accession to power, obtained from him still further information as to the length of his reign.

3. The third instance quoted is concerned with the extraordinary dream of Archelaus which came to him shortly before

[1] So Schürer Moffatt, and others.
[2] *War*, II. viii. 12.
[3] 105–104 B.C.
[4] *War*, I. iii. 5; *Ant.*, XIII. xi. 2.
[5] *Ant.*, XV. x. 5.

his summons to Rome and subsequent banishment. The usual diviners of the royal court having failed to satisfy the King, Simon, 'a man of the sect of the Essenes,' offered a sinister and, as the event proved, an accurate interpretation of the monarch's vision.[1]

Interesting though these statements are, detailed comment is not necessary. The belief in and practice of divination were of old date among the Jews,[2] and few things proved so impressive to the men of those times. If, as seems to be intended, we may believe that this power was possessed by a great number of Essenes, it would go far to explain both their own continuance as a sect, and the influence they exerted over their contemporaries. This supposition, however, we take leave to doubt. A few instances would be quite sufficient to strike the public mind and secure for the sect profound reverence.

Of their skill in healing we are not informed so fully, but what we do know serves to show where the Essenes stood in the matter of medicine. Josephus is again our authority: 'They also take exceptional pains to select from the writings of the ancients what is good for soul and body, which leads them to discover medicinal roots and stones which have the property of curing ailments.'[3]

It is well known that in the Old Testament sickness and disease were closely associated with sin, and due therefore to the anger of God. Later, they were connected with the evil purposes of demoniac powers. These ideas prevailed down to the days of Jesus Christ, as several incidents recorded in the New Testament attest. It is quite in harmony with this that the cure of disease was mainly in the hands of the priests, and it would seem that at one stage the use of drugs or herbs or any other material means was frowned upon. Even so late a compilation as 2 Chronicles takes up this attitude: 'And . . . Asa was diseased in his feet: his disease was exceeding great: yet in his disease he sought not the Lord, but the physicians.'[4] But a change was not long in coming. This may be seen in Ben Sirach, who devotes a section of chap. xxxviii. to the physician, whose beneficent labours he ascribes to the goodness of God:

[1] *Ant.*, XVII. xiii. 3; *War*, II. vii. 3.
[2] Cf. Zech. x. 2, as late as the third century B.C.
[3] *War*, II. viii. 6.
[4] xvi. 12.

'Cultivate the physician in accordance with the need of him,
For him also hath God ordained.
It is from God that the physician getteth wisdom,
And from the king he receiveth gifts.

. . . . .

God hath created medicines out of the earth,
And let not a discerning man reject them,' &c.[1]

With these last words may be compared Josephus's description of Essene practice in searching for 'medicinal roots and stones,' &c. Lightfoot,[2] Morrison,[3] and others, believe that the Essenes were engaged in the 'practice of magic,' and though this may very well have been the case, it cannot be regarded as a necessary inference from the words of Josephus when these are compared with those quoted from Ben Sirach. But even if it were so, they would not be very different from other Jews of their time who, believing that the cause of disease was not material but spiritual, sought to chase it away by the use of magical, otherwise spiritual, agencies.

[1] Ecclus. xxxviii. 1–4.
[2] *Jews under the Romans*, p. 336.
[3] Op. cit., p. 375 f.

Chapter VI

NON-JEWISH ELEMENTS

The questions arising out of a survey of Essene beliefs and practices are both numerous and important, and much attention has been devoted to their investigation. Most students, as has been pointed out, continue to regard Essenism as in the main a development having its foundation in Judaism. This is especially the case with Jewish scholars, e.g. Frankel, Jost, Graetz, Derenbourg, Geiger, and Kohler; and to these names may be added many of Gentile origin, viz. Ewald, Hausrath, Reuss, Kuenen, Lucius, Hilgenfeld, Westcott, Lightfoot, and others. But the majority in this second list hold that other and external influences materially assisted and guided this development, and it is at this juncture that divergence takes place. Jewish scholars demur to external influences of any consequence. And the others are by no means agreed in their attempts to locate the quarter from which the special outside influences proceeded. In all there are four possible sources from which these may have emanated, viz. Syrian nature-religion, Buddhism, Zoroastrianism, and Pythagoreanism or Greek thought generally. Each of these must be examined in turn.

But it may be well to make clear first of all what is meant by those who speak of Essenism as mainly a development of Judaism, and how much is left to be otherwise explained. In general, it implies that, as stated in chap. iii., it is derived from the Chasidim, or their successors the Pharisees, and in either case arises from that yearning after legal purity which was the inspiration of both. One recent writer, however, will have none of this. It was not the spirit of Pharisaism which was the driving force, but the Essene dislike of all the noise and distractions of town life.[1] That this was the proximate cause

[1] Friedländer, *Die relig. Bewegungen*, &c., p. 130.

of the retirement to the quiet shores of the Dead Sea is probably true. But it still leaves place for a motive for this desire, and it is difficult to discover a better one than that already indicated.

As for the point of departure, there is much variety of opinion. Ritschl, for instance, holds that development began in the carrying out of the idea of the 'universal priesthood,' spoken of in Exod. xix. 6 : 'And ye shall be unto Me a kingdom of priests, and an holy nation.' Attractive as this suggestion is, it does not strike one on reflection as helping much, for, though the record shows that the Essenes did possess a priesthood, it does not state that all the members were priests, and nowhere lays any particular stress upon the institution.

For Wendt[1] the clue is to be found in a development of Pharisaic transcendentalism, hence the refusal to offer to God sacrifices so gross as the blood of animals. There appears to be much truth in this line of thought. Lucius finds the point of divergence in the illegitimacy of the existing priesthood. Others refrain from the attempt to fix upon any special feature, contenting themselves with pointing to the seductive influence of outsiders. Schürer's view is well known : 'Essenism then is in the first place merely Pharisaism in the superlative degree. . . . Two main features especially, the rigid legalism and the punctilious care for ceremonial cleanness, are genuinely Pharisaic.'[2] A. Jülicher concludes simply : 'Beyond question the Essenes represented a purely Jewish type.'[3]

Confronted with such various and to a certain extent conflicting opinions, the present writer adheres to the view that 'the yearning after ceremonial purity' was the chief motive force. It is sufficient to account for their (probably) gradual separation from their fellows ; their stringent regulations regarding contact with others, even Essenes of a lower grade ; their abstention from the married state, to so large an extent, the uncleanness associated with which was already referred to in the Law of Moses[4] ; their dislike of bloody sacrifices ; their ablutions and white garments ; and so on.

Yet though the point of divergence from ordinary Judaism may thus have been ascertained, much remains in Essenism which can hardly be regarded as a natural development of

[1] Cf. his *Teaching of Jesus*, i. 51. [2] *J. P. T. J. C.*, II. ii. 209 f.
[3] *E. Bib.*, art. 'Essenes.'
[4] Cf. Exod. xix. 5 ; Lev. xv. 16–18 ; Deut. xxiii. 11 f.

pure Judaism unaffected by external influences. While recognizing that isolated and estranged men may of themselves pursue eccentric courses in the development of ideas which at first belonged to the common stock, it cannot be supposed that actual contradictions and entirely new practices are likely to arise without the intervention of some new force. How are we to account, for instance, for the belief in the soul's pre-existence, or the dualistic antagonism between soul and body, or the attitude towards the sun, or the taint of determinism? Parallels to these eccentricities may sometimes be found, as has been done, in contemporary literature, but even the parallels may need explanation, too. And it may be said, after all allowances have been made for possible 'tendency' in the statements of Josephus and Philo, that such features as those named do not emerge from Judaism, and have never been regarded as any part of its contribution to the religion of the world. We must, therefore, examine those systems of thought which may conceivably have acted as the impulsive force upon Essenism.

I. Syrian Nature Religion

Lipsius is the chief supporter of the theory of the influence of Syrian heathenism,[1] though it is only just to say that he would add Greek and Buddhist influences in a minor degree. The points of connexion between Syrian religion and Essenism cannot be called numerous and are far from being decisive.

According to Lipsius, Syrian nature-worship shows itself in the sun-worship of the Essenes, and to this he would add their alleged magical pretensions, e.g. in foretelling the future, healing by the use of roots and stones, and the claim, as he believes, to cast out demons.

Any strength which this view possesses is derived from the proximity of the two peoples. Undoubtedly in earlier times the 'inhabitants of the land' affected the beliefs and coloured the practices of the older Israelites to a considerable extent, but that occurred long before the birth of the sects described by Josephus. The influences of those early days had been absorbed or rejected generations before that time by the people as a whole, and there is no reason to suppose that there was any

[1] Art. Essäer, Schenkel's *Bibel-Lexicon*.

particular disposition on the part of the Essenes to return to what the Prophets had so stoutly denounced.

Respecting the items of alleged analogy mentioned, it is to be remarked, first, that adoration of the sun was practised by others than the Syrians—the Parsees, for instance ; secondly, that the attempt to forecast the future was nothing novel in Jewish thought and habit or indeed among Semites generally ; further, that as there is no warrant for inferring from the Essene study of the medicinal properties of roots and stones any pretension to cast out demons, this supposed analogy must likewise fall to the ground.

It is, moreover, quite clear that the most characteristic practices of Syrian heathenism were wanting in Essenism. Religious prostitution, self-mutilation, the sacrifice of children, the use of Mazzeboth and Asherim, to mention only a few striking features, were not only not adopted by the Essenes, but were utterly repugnant to their whole spirit and outlook on life. Conscious imitation of the Syrian religion seems therefore quite incredible, and there is no need to infer even unconscious colouring of a direct character.

II. Buddhism

The suggested connexion between a faith whose home was in India and the Essenism of the Dead Sea shore seems at first sight sufficiently improbable, and is so regarded by most scholars to-day. It was championed at first by Hilgenfeld with considerable ingenuity, but at a subsequent period he felt himself obliged to abandon the idea.

Looking at the theory first of all from the standpoint of geographical possibility, contact between the two cannot be treated as altogether out of the question, though, as we think, highly improbable. Following the conquests of Alexander the Great interest between East and West was mutual. Schürer mentions the prolonged sojourn of Megasthenes in India,[1] and his detailed description of the country and its inhabitants ; likewise the commercial intercourse which took place by way of the Red Sea during the Graeco-Roman period.[2] Mahaffy also refers to the great Oriental reaction which at this time

[1] *Circa* 300 B.C. [2] *J.P.T.J.C.*, II. ii., p. 215.

influenced Hellenism. Açoka, the pious grandson of Chandragupta, 'gave free scope to the strong missionary spirit of the Buddhist priests, and we are told in his inscriptions that their apostles reached into the kingdoms of the Hellenistic world.'[1] Against this may be set the statement of Lightfoot, who makes a most careful study of the matter: 'With one doubtful exception . . . there is apparently no notice in either heathen or Christian writers which points to the presence of a Buddhist within the limits of the Roman Empire, till long after the Essenes had ceased to exist.'[2] On geographical grounds, therefore, the probability of Buddhist contact with Essenism seems at best doubtful.

Let us turn, however, to the supposed points of similarity. These are not numerous and seem entirely inconclusive. Schürer and Morrison indeed make the remark that between the two there are 'striking parallels,' or 'striking resemblances,' but unfortunately do not state what they are. So far as we can discover they are only three in number; monasticism, asceticism, and the well-known Four Steps of Buddhism. In regard to the first two, it is scarcely necessary to do more than point out that, given the spirit of Essenism, coenobitism and asceticism follow naturally enough, without any impetus from Buddhism or any other religion. It had so acted before in Judaism, and has affected Christianity in like manner, and indeed the world over the same spirit has produced a similar result. Moreover, there is a not unimportant difference in this matter between the Buddhists and the Essenes, as between the Therapeutae and the Essenes. Though the Essenes withdrew from the world they retained manual labour as a necessary part of their life and discipline; on the contrary, Buddhist priests refrained from it. In reference also to the alleged analogy between the Four Steps of Buddhism and the Four Grades of Essenism, differences existed between the two both as to the mode by which one might pass from one grade to the other, and also in respect to the goal in view. In Buddhism the whole series of 'steps' might, under certain conditions, be mounted at one stride; but in Essenism each higher 'stage' was attained only after a definite period of time and evidence of an approved character. So, too, in regard to the goal at which they aimed; the Buddhist sought and

[1] *Alex. Empire*, p. 139 f. [2] Op. cit., p. 392 f.

attained annihilation, the Essene found his ideal in a pure life in this present world.[1] The judgement of Fairweather, who pronounces the Buddhist influence to be 'scarcely probable,'[2] errs, if at all, on the side of leniency, and one is rather inclined to the stronger statement of Schürer, who describes this supposed influence as the most 'far-fetched' of all.[3]

III. Zoroastrianism

The improbability of the two influences just dealt with is soon apparent, but the suggestion of Zoroastrian influence is more serious, and has already won the adhesion of men whose opinion is of great weight. Hilgenfeld (latterly), Lightfoot, Cheyne, and Edersheim find in this faith the chief factor in the Essenes' departure from Judaism, though it is to be remembered that Hilgenfeld associates Buddhism with it.

It is easy enough to see, as Lightfoot shows, that Zoroastrianism had sufficient opportunity to exert its influence over Judaism as a whole, and that inducement to do so would not be lacking. The Babylonian Exile would bring some of the best Jews into intimate contact with this great system and afford them ample opportunity for the study of its tenets and observation of its practices. Moreover, the consideration shown to the exiles by the Persian Cyrus was calculated to make them very susceptible to the influence it brought to bear upon their minds. Again, though the Persian Empire was destroyed by Alexander the Persian religion remained unaffected, and its active presence in the general *mélange* of religious ideas in the first century of our era sufficiently attests its continuity and power.

There is little doubt that the presence of Zoroastrianism can be traced both in the post-exilic literature of the Old Testament and in the Apocryphal writings, in various developments of thought not previously noteworthy. Eschatology, Angelology, and Demonology are instances of this, though it may be doubted whether this influence is as widespread as is sometimes asserted. Now Essenism, as a genuine product of Judaism, would naturally feel the effect of all this. But much more than this early result is suggested. In such Essene peculiarities as the adoration of the sun, angelology, dualism,

[1] Cf. Lightfoot, op. cit., 393 f. [2] Op. cit., 211. [3] *J.P.T.J.C.* II. ii. 215.

striving after purity, the doctrine of the soul, ablutions, the use of white garments, &c., its development is alleged to have been due to Zoroastrianism.

That there are points of contact in most of these matters between the two systems cannot be disputed, but careful scrutiny of the data does not leave the mind entirely convinced that the older faith affected the younger to any considerable degree.

(*a*) *Sun Worship*

In regard to the Essene attitude toward the sun, Lightfoot remarks : ' The Zoroastrian symbolism of light, and consequent worship of the sun as the fountain of light, will explain those anomalous notices of the Essenes in which they are represented as paying reverence to this luminary.'[1] Apropos of this J. H. Moulton points out that ' There was a Magian sun-worship which was not Zoroastrian.'[2] We have already stated to what extent, according to our view, this alleged worship of the sun is to be admitted, and there we might leave the matter. But something further may be added.

It may be admitted at once that, long before the existence of our sect, the pious men and prophets of Israel had found it necessary to rebuke their people for lapsing into sun-worship. In the earliest instance[3] the altars and horses dedicated to the sun, which Josiah destroyed, must have been introduced by Manasseh, who had been under the influence of Assyria. Ezek. viii. 16 probably reflects Persian influence. But this occurred centuries before Essenism was born, and in the intervening period the most rigid monotheism had held sway among all devout Jews. For the strict sect of Essenes to hark back again to a practice which had not only evoked the fierce denunciation of the Prophets and been obliterated is of course possible, but one cannot regard it as probable. Moreover, their ' reverence ' for the sun need not have come from the Zoroastrians, at least directly. We incline to a much simpler explanation and one more natural. The Essenes were now shut out from the Temple services with all their elaborate ritual, but they were in constant contact with Nature at every moment of the day and at every season of the year. Like all

[1] Op. cit., p. 385. [2] *H. D. B.*, iv. 992b. [3] 2 Kings xxiii. 5, 11.

devout men living in such circumstances, their utter dependence on the sun, the gift of God and the presiding genius of their agricultural life, must have been continually present to their minds. What act, then, so natural and appropriate as to rise before its arrival and perform their acts of devotion with faces turned in the direction of its expected appearance! Devoutness of soul and the religious influence of Nature in combination have often led men to act thus, and the world-fleeing Essenes would not be greatly concerned about the possible misinterpretation of their conduct.

(*b*) *Angelology*

In this instance Lightfoot depends upon two points of alleged analogy, viz. 'the invocations of spirits, which form a very prominent feature in the ritual of the *Zend-Avesta*,' and 'the doctrine of intermediary beings concerned in the government of nature and of man.'[1] Cheyne in his turn lends support by referring to 'so-called fravashis, those "guardian-angels" which were so linked to men as to form virtually a part of human nature, and which were practically indistinguishable from souls.'[2]

We have already alluded in a preceding chapter to the extraordinary development on this subject among the Jews in post-exilic times, not only in Old Testament literature, but even more in non-Canonical writings. The contention that this was largely due to the influence of Zoroastrianism seems to us in every way probable, but it is not evident that any greater impression was made upon the Essenes in this respect than, say, upon the Pharisees. We know of nothing in their beliefs on this subject to differentiate them in any way from their Jewish contemporaries who were responsible for the Apocryphal literature.

(*c*) *Dualism*

In a previous reference to this topic we gave reasons for the opinion that Essenism was not in reality dualistic, but had 'tendencies' in that direction. We have now to inquire how these tendencies are to be accounted for. Lightfoot unhesitatingly looks in the direction of Zoroastrianism. 'For though dualism may not represent the oldest theology of the *Zend-Avesta* in its unadulterated form, yet long before the era

[1] Op. cit., 385 f. [2] *Orig. of Ps.*, p. 420.

of which we are speaking it had become the fundamental principle of the Persian religion.'[1] Cheyne adopts a similar view, though less emphatically.

That Zoroastrianism was dualistic is not open to question. Their supreme deity is named Ahura Mazdah, or Ormazd, and over against him is Angra Mainyu, or Ahriman; the one stands for good, the other for evil; the one created light, the other darkness; and these two, with all their hosts of angels and demons, are engaged in a perpetual conflict which can only come to an end when Ahura utterly destroys Ahriman. Now it is not maintained by any that the Essenes had a doctrine of Satan in any respect different from the rest of the Jews, nor that their asceticism is to be interpreted as a struggle against a hostile deity. Indeed, nothing can be asserted beyond the supposition that they were tainted with the idea of 'evil powers'; and one finds it extremely difficult to discern even the taint. One of the most eminent writers on this subject sums up the matter thus: 'Essene dualism seems to owe nothing to that of the *Vendidad*, which has no philosophical theory of the inherent evil of matter and no trace of asceticism.'[2]

(*d*) *Doctrine of the Soul, its Pre-existence and Final Destiny*

The most striking instance of similarity remaining to be considered is found in the Essene doctrine of the soul. The Zoroastrian doctrine of pre-existence is found in the 'fravashis,' who were regarded as man's heavenly counterpart. But an important difference at once appears when the two doctrines are placed side by side. According to the Essenes the soul takes up its abode in the body with the greatest reluctance, 'by a sort of natural spell to be imprisoned,' and leaves it at death with the greatest delight; 'it joyfully soars away into freedom from the long bondage.' On the other hand, Mazdeism taught that 'the pre-existent souls ("fravashis") came to earth voluntarily, to join the warfare against evil.'[3] Here any contact there may be between the two wears the aspect of antagonism, not obligation. As to the Essene doctrine of the soul's destiny, Cheyne holds that it was borrowed from two sources, a Babylonian and a Persian—both Hebraized. The idea of the happy island, he declares, comes from Assyrio-

[1] Op. cit., p. 383.
[2] J. H. Moulton, *H. D. B.*, iv. 992b
[3] Moulton, *H. D. B.*, iv. 992b.

Babylonian poets, but the description of Hades is distinctly Zoroastrian.[1] With this Söderblom and Moulton agree.

On other points of supposed resemblance between these two faiths little need be said. In such matters as striving after purity by ablutions and symbolizing it by the use of white garments there is undoubtedly some similarity, but though this may be due to imitation it cannot be asserted with certainty. The use of magic, even if it were proved in regard to the Essenes, was common enough among the Jews in ancient times and may have been merely a survival. And as for their repudiation of animal sacrifices, while Schürer apparently believes that in this they resembled the Zoroastrians,[2] Moulton holds the opposite view: 'Mazdeism has always had a sacrifice of flesh, as well as the libation and the Haoma offering.'[3]

Several matters in which distinct dissimilarity appears might be mentioned (e.g. the absence of celibacy among the Zoroastrians), but enough has been said to justify the conclusion that, save, perhaps, in their conception of Hades and in one or two minor matters, the alleged parallels between the two faiths do not indicate any considerable indebtedness of the younger to the older. We have still to find the force which was the main instrument in guiding Essene development, and to this we now turn.[4]

IV. Greek and Especially Pythagorean Influence

The idea that the non-Judean development of Essenism was due to Greek influences begins with Josephus, and probably his advocacy of this view has hindered more than helped its acceptance. This writer's disposition to flatter his readers has been mentioned already, and nothing need be added save this, that his suggestion may turn out to be correct. In modern times Zeller has been the chief upholder of Greek influence, and, while some parts of his argument may be open to criticism, it is difficult to see how his main contention can be answered. Baur, Herzfeld, Keim, Schürer, Friedländer, A. Jülicher, and many others, are to be reckoned among his supporters. Schürer may be taken as representative of the general opinion of these writers when he declares that this view has 'the

[1] *Orig. of Ps.*, p. 419 f. [2] *J. P. T. J. C.*, II. ii., p. 216. [3] *H. D. B.*, iv. 992a.
[4] Cf. Moffatt, *E. R. E.*, v. 401a; Sch., *J. P. T. J. C.*, II. ii., p. 216.

largest amount of probability in its favour.'[1] Friedländer, refusing emphatically to admit any influence from Pharisaism, maintains that the sect is wholly under Greek influence.

On the question of the historical probability of Pythagorean influence Lightfoot's opposition must first be noted. He reminds us that Pythagoreanism disappeared as a dominant system of thought about the middle of the fourth century B.C., and that its reappearance under the name of Neo-Pythagoreanism did not occur until three centuries later. So that its alleged influence on Essenism, which arose in the middle of the second century B.C., occurred at a time when it had ceased to exist as a philosophical force. This statement is of course literally correct up to a point, but it overlooks the fact that a body of teaching of the importance of Pythagoreanism cannot disappear as if by magic, and leave its contemporaries and successors as if it had never been. As a matter of fact it still remained as an important influence in many centres of Greek thought. Moreover, as Conybeare[2] shows, the relations between Greeks and Jews at or near the time when Essenism took its beginning were intimate and continuous; also many Jews in the Maccabean period bore Greek names, indicating the common use of the Greek language in Palestine. This is indeed so universally recognized that it need not be laboured. Opportunity enough existed for being affected by Greek thought if the disposition were present. But was it?

It must be confessed that one would not expect the Essenes, any more than the Pharisees, to adopt Hellenistic views, in fact quite the contrary. But Alexandrian Jews had no such scruple, and the relations between them and the Essenes must have been particularly close, if one may judge by the frequent parallels between their views, to which Alexandrian literature bears testimony. So that though Greek influence, had it come directly, would have failed to impress or divert Essene thought, it would wear a totally different aspect coming through Jewish-Alexandrian channels. And as the teaching of Egyptian Jews was at that time saturated with Greek thought the Essenes unconsciously imbibed Greek ideas.

This being made clear, we may now examine the alleged similarities between the two systems. Scrutiny of the minutest

[1] Op. cit., II. ii. 216.

[2] *H. D. B.*, i. 771b.

character has been made on this point by Zeller, and all that remains is to mention the discovered parallels. They consist of the following: bodily purity and general asceticism; separation from the ordinary life of the world; corporate life with community of goods; stringent regulations regarding initiation; general simplicity of life, including freedom from sensuality; belief in Fate which rules all men and things; repudiation of oaths, marriages, and animal sacrifices, the practice of ablutions and the wearing of white garments; pre-existence of the soul and views as to its nature and incarnation; dualism in regard to soul and body; the life beyond the grave; the allegorizing of sacred books; and a curious opposition between right and left.

Of course there were several respects in which Pythagoreanism was utterly opposed to Essenism. For instance, Pythagoreans were polytheists; they believed in the transmigration of souls—a sufficient reason for their neglect of animal sacrifice; they cultivated learning, believed in a theory of numbers, used oil, their leader married, and so on. But the points of similarity remain. The only ground of hesitancy which the dissimilarities suggest is in regard to the improbability of the Essenes borrowing from so tainted a source. This is, we grant, a real difficulty, but the way out of it is as explained above With Pythagoreanism Essenism had no direct or conscious contact and would probably have repudiated the idea of such a thing. But unquestionably the Pythagoreans influenced Alexandrian Jews, and the latter handed on the influence to their compatriots at home. In much the same way it is probable that the few recognizable traces of Zoroastrianism found in Essenism were mediated through Pythagoreanism, and so in this roundabout way ultimately reached the shores of the Dead Sea.

Chapter VII

RELATION TO CHRISTIANITY AND THE EARLY HERESIES

As hinted in Chap. i, there are some who maintain that between Essenism and Christianity there exists a somewhat close relationship. Not only is this affirmed as between Jesus Christ and our sect, but likewise in the case of the heresies which sprang to the front in subsequent years. It now remains to examine this assertion more closely.

I. The Origins of Christianity

Ginsburg is quite definite in regard to the relation between Christ and the Essenes. He says: 'It will therefore hardly be doubted that our Saviour belonged to this holy brotherhood.'[1] Graetz agrees with this. Ginsburg's statement is based on the extraordinary supposition that all Jews belong to one of the three great sects. If this were granted, it is easy to see how, by a simple process of elimination, Jesus Christ can be shown to have been an Essene. But the assumption is entirely gratuitous, and the 'people of the land' were probably more numerous than all the three sects put together.

F. C. Conybeare[2] draws attention to the many similarities between Essenes and Christians, but rightly decides against anything beyond a superficial and incidental connexion, though suspecting some close affinity in the case of John the Baptizer. He makes a comparison between the Essene poenitentia (here meaning ennui) and the Baptist's preaching of repentance; the practice of asceticism in both cases; 'the more so as John's sphere of activity in the Valley of the Jordan lay close to the Essene settlement on the shores of the Dead Sea.'[3] But the differences are much more striking than the agreements. For instance, both used ablutions, but for quite different

[1] *Essenes*, p. 24. [2] Art. 'Essenes,' *H. D. B.* [3] Ibid., i. 771a.

purposes: the Essenes habitually, in order to attain purity or remove impurity; John as the sign of repentance and initiation into the Messianic Kingdom. Again, John heralded the near approach of the Messiah, his whole ministry being devoted to that end; of this there is no suggestion among the Essenes. Once more, John's attack on Herod, because of his contempt for morality, is in clear contrast with the Essene custom of abstention from interference in affairs outside their own circle.

In regard to teaching, several very interesting parallels with early Christianity may be adduced, e.g. general simplicity of life; brotherhood of mutual helpfulness (though in Christianity women were permitted to share); the prohibition of oaths; the exaltation of the poor and humble; baptisms and celibacy.[1] But the differences are obvious and crucial. The members of the sect withdrew from the world of affairs and were defiled by the least contact with it: Jesus went wherever man might go and consorted even with 'publicans and sinners'; they were ascetics: He lived the ordinary life of a human being; they were unusually stringent, even for Jews, in the observance of the Sabbath: His enemies charged Him with laxity in regard to it; they did not honour the Temple-services: He frequented them to the end; they seem not to have even alluded to the coming Messiah: He proclaimed Himself to be the Messiah. These facts alone, and more might be added, make it impossible to believe that Christianity owed anything directly to Essenism. The argument which aims at proving the friendly disposition of Jesus towards the Essenes, because, judging from the New Testament, He never attacked them, whereas He did denounce both Pharisees and Sadducees, is not very convincing.[2] According to general admission the Essenes were unobtrusive to a degree: they were neither propagandists nor even mixed with the people; on the other hand it was not the practice of Jesus to oppose men unless obliged to do so in the high interests of His mission.

Some would add the name of James, the brother of Jesus,

[1] Cf. Matt. xix. 12.

[2] H. W. Garrod ventures the remark that the Essenes 'never came into conflict with our Lord because our Lord was in so many things their disciple' (*Relig. of All Good Men*, p. 117). Against this may be set the opinion of Bousset: 'Jesus had nothing whatever to do with the sect of the Essenes.' The whole section should be read (*Jesus*, p. 34 f.). See also Friedländer, op. cit., 164 ff.

to the list of Christian Essenes, but there is little warrant for this.

II. Heresies

Turning now to the sect's supposed influence on the Christian heresies, we meet with a considerable body of opinion in its favour sustained by names which cannot be set aside easily.

Lightfoot has devoted much attention to the possible association of Essenism with the Gnostic, or semi-Gnostic, influences affecting the Church at Colossae.[1] In his able and comprehensive review of the influences, theoretical and practical, which threatened the pure faith of that infant Church, he undoubtedly reveals the presence of an incipient Gnosticism. But when he goes on to argue that these elements are due to the influence of Essenism, his position seems more than doubtful. But even he does ' not assume a precise identity of origin, but only an essential affinity of type, with the Essenes of the mother-country.'[2] Hort was at one time favourable to Lightfoot's theory, but later abandoned it : ' There is much and high modern authority for tracing the teachings condemned by St. Paul at Colossae to Essene influences ; and in lecturing on the Epistle to the Romans I spoke of that as the most probable origin. But further examination has convinced me that this is too much to say. There is no tangible evidence for Essenism out of Palestine.'[3] In like manner Ed. Reuss denies most positively that the Essenes exerted any direct influence on the origin or the theology of the Christianity of the first century. He believes that the Essenes described by Philo and Josephus were no more heard of after the Fall of Jerusalem, though they reappear in various forms, as for example in the Ebionites of the second century (A.D.).[4]

Against all supposed similarities must be set the following considerations : the Essenes are unknown outside Palestine prior to the destruction of Jerusalem ; they were not propagandists ; their influence cannot have been spread by their literature, or, almost certainly, the names of some of their books, if not their contents, would have been rescued from

[1] Cf. op. cit. [2] Op. cit., p. 92 f. [3] *Judaistic Christianity*. p. 128.

[4] *Vide Christian Theol. in Apos. Age*, i. 107 ; also Moffatt, *Histor. New Testament*, p. 215 f. ; Bernard, *Past. Epp. C. G. T.*, lvi.

oblivion; in their own land they were so unobtrusive that they never came into contact with the Founder of Christianity, so far as we can discover. And further, it is evident that some of the most significant features of the Colossian heresy were lacking in Essenism, and that those which were present can be better accounted for on other grounds.[1]

Epiphanius, in his work on heresies,[2] considers that the asceticism and frequent ablutions of the Ebionites are to be attributed to Essene influence. He also regards the Elkesaites as descendants of those Essenes who became Christians. The *Book of Elkesai*, which appeared about A.D. 100, was, as he tells us, in great repute among the Essenes. The contents of this volume are made known to us by Hippolytus.[3] Brandt[4] holds to the central fact that the Essenes and the Ebionites both accepted *Elkesai*. On this question, it may safely be said, no conclusion can be reached with any degree of certainty. Our witnesses, Epiphanius[5] and Hippolytus,[6] are late, the former especially, and where, in treating of the earlier history, they depart from Josephus, they show themselves unreliable guides. However, it seems fairly certain that after the Fall of Jerusalem many Essenes did become Christians and accompanied those Jews who retired to Pella, on the east of the Jordan.[7] What became of their old views it is not possible to say. On the one hand they may have been absorbed in the new Christian faith and become indistinguishable from it; or they may have been merely annexed thereto and exerted a reciprocal influence on it. There seems to be no evidence sufficiently clear to allow of anything beyond this surmise.

In bringing to a conclusion this brief investigation into the history, beliefs, and affinities of this interesting and perplexing sect, who, according to Jülicher, 'prepared the way for the new world-religion,'[8] we may recall and endorse the well-known eulogy of Ewald: 'The Essenes were the noblest and most memorable development which the ancient religion could produce without attempting to pass beyond itself.'[9]

[1] Cf. Peake, *Com. Coloss.*, *in Expos. Gr. Test.*, iii. 486 f.
[2] *Haer.*, xix. 2, xx. 3, xxx. 3.
[3] *Refut. Heresies*, ix. 8–12.
[4] Art. 'Elkesaites,' *E. R. E.*
[5] Died in A.D. 403.
[6] Lived at the end of the second century (A.D.).
[7] Cf. Beveridge, art. 'Ebionism,' *E. R. E.*
[8] *E. Bib.*, ii, col. 1400.
[9] *History of Israel*, v. 375.

PART IV

THE ZEALOTS

SYNOPSIS OF PART IV

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

PAGE

Resentment to Romans—Kirsopp Lake—Background of teaching of Jesus—The Zealots—Sources of information 327

CHAPTER II

NAME AND GENERAL CHARACTERISTICS

Names · Cananaeans, Zealots, Sicarii—Significance of each . . . 329
General characteristics : Josephus 329
A party, not a sect—Opposition to Roman Government—Period covered from 63 B.C. to A.D. 70 330
Diverse elements—Relation to Sadducees and Pharisees—Later judgement against the Zealots 331
Failure—Cruelties 332

CHAPTER III

THE ROMAN GOVERNMENT AND THE JEWS

The character of the Government one of the causes of discontent—Earlier relations with the Romans—Roman policy to conciliate—Roman conquest in 63 B.C. 333
I. From 63 B.C. *to* 6 A.D. A client state—Early severity modified—Jewish pride wounded 335
Herod's domination : good and bad intermixed—His cruelties—Jewish indictment—Archelaus of the same type 336
II. From A.D. 6 *a Roman Province.* People requested this—Contrast between central and local government—Judea an Imperial Province 338
The Procurators—Method of government—Taxation—Place of the Jewish Sanhedrin 339
Religious tolerance—High-priestly office treated with contempt . 341

CHAPTER IV

THE MESSIANIC HOPE

The root of the unrest was religious—Jehovah's chosen people—Messianic Kingdom expected which would give them dominance—Story told in their literature : 343
I. Psalms of Solomon—Bitterness against Pompey—Victorious deliverer expected—Weapons spiritual—Blessings material 344
II. Zadokite Fragment—Attacks Pharisees—'Star' and 'Teacher' sent, Messiah now expected—Early appearance looked for . 346
III. Assumption of Moses—Apocalyptic—Deliverance expected, but not by carnal means—No Messiah mentioned—Probably a counterblast to Zealotism 347
IV. New Testament 350
(*a*) Messianic expectation widespread—Illustrations of . . 350
(*b*) Contained revolutionary elements—'Hosannas'—Warning of Jesus—Disciples' thoughts 352

PAGE
V. Philo Judaeus—He too expects a deliverer—What he would do . 353
VI. Syr. Apoc. of Baruch—Tribulations expected—Great Empires to be overthrown by Messiah's 354
VII. Josephus—Attributes Jewish rebellion to Messianic hope—His explanation of the Jewish error 355

CHAPTER V

Beginnings of Revolt

I. At the death of Herod—Judas and Matthias pull down the golden eagle—Burnt alive—Vengeance demanded, numbers slain . . 357
II. Under Archelaus—Two revolts during his absence—Embassy visits Rome—Parable of Pounds—Roman government granted on further demand 358
III. Census of Quirinius, A.D. 6–7—Ordinary procedure—Joazar's advice refused by many—Revolt under Judas of Gamala and Sadduc, a Pharisee—Patriotic and Religious reasons—Fighting—Zealotism founded 359

CHAPTER VI

The Movement Develops—Provocation and Resistance

I. Early Procurators from A.D. 6–26.—Silence—Burden of taxation—Jews in Rome—High-priestly office—Local oppression . . . 361
II. Pilate's rule, A.D. 26–36—His evil character—Incidents—The standards—Temple treasure seized 362
The gilt shields—Samaritans slaughtered—Galileans . . . 364
Jesus *v.* Barabbas 365
III. Caligula the Emperor, A.D. 37–41—Contrast with Vitellius—Caligula's character 366
Jew-hunt at Alexandria—Orders his statue to be placed in the Temple—Frantic remonstrances 367

CHAPTER VII

Agrippa (A.D. 41–44)—A Lull in the Storm

The new Emperor Claudius favours Agrippa, the Jew—Appoints him over Judea and Samaria—Orders his subordinates to respect Jewish customs and religion—Agrippa observes Pharisaic requirements—Persecutes Christians—Yet his religion only a veneer . . . 369

CHAPTER VIII

Sporadic Rebellions

I. Cuspius Fadus, A.D. 44–*c.* 47 371
II. Tiberius Alexander, A.D. *c.* 47–48 373
III. Ventidius Cumanus, A.D. 48–52 373
IV. Felix, A.D. 52–60 375
V. Porcius Festus, A.D. 60–62 378
VI. Albinus, A.D. 62–64 379
VII. Gessius Florus, A.D. 64–66 381

CHAPTER IX

The War and the Destruction of the Jewish State

Emperor's sacrifices forbidden—Attempts to maintain peace fail—The history of the war in brief 384
Jews quarrel with each other—Jerusalem the cockpit—Conquest of Galilee—Confusion in Jerusalem—Moderates, Sicarii, Zealots, Idumeans 385
Roman delaying tactics 386
Siege and Fall of Jerusalem—Other fortresses hold out for a time—Later rebellions—Subsequent fate of Jerusalem 386

CHAPTER X

Jesus and Zealotism

PAGE

No open contact between the two—Reasons for this—Jesus opposed to Zealot spirit—Also to the more usual political idea of the Kingdom . 388

Possible allusions to Zealotism :

(1) Temptations of Jesus 389
(2) Baptist's conception of the Messiah and His Kingdom . . 390
(3) Choice of Simon the Zealot, or Cananean 391
(4) Request of James and John 392
(5) Tribute to Caesar 392
(6) Triumphal Entry into Jerusalem 393
(7) Significant sayings and practices 393

Jesus an anti-Zealot 394

Chapter I

INTRODUCTION

Even those whose knowledge of the times of Jesus is limited to the picture presented in the New Testament can hardly be unaware of the underlying current of opposition between the people and their Roman overlords. And from their acquaintance with general history they know that this culminated in a great Jewish upheaval which resulted in the extinction of the Jewish State in A.D. 70. But it is not so generally recognized that this final and calamitous uprising was only the climax of a movement which had been slowly gathering strength for more than sixty years. Beneath all that tranquil Jewish life of which we catch glimpses in the Gospel narratives, a party was coming into being whose forces grew steadily in numbers and intensity, colouring and disturbing the life of the nation until at length it swept the whole nation into its ranks, even the most reluctant, and deliberately brought about the clash of organized warfare.

Not only, therefore, do we get a fuller and truer view of the history of the period by taking this movement into account, but probably many of the sayings of Jesus can only be properly understood with the menace of this propaganda as their background. Kirsopp Lake, in a recent volume, says: 'But for us their (i.e. the Zealots') significance is that they are a very important part of the background against which we have to set the teaching of the Gospels, and that they are often overlooked.' And in another place he adds the following striking paragraph: 'The polemic against the Pharisees and Scribes in the Gospels has always been recognized: but that against the Zealots is quite as important, and has unfortunately been often overlooked. Much of the teaching of Jesus becomes intelligible only when we place it in contrast to the Zealots'. 'He demanded that men should believe that the Kingdom would

come, not because of their fighting, but because of their suffering. " In your suffering—your patient endurance—shall you win your lives" ; " he that suffers to the end shall be saved" ; " resist not evil," and similar passages, seem to be clearly directed against the exactly opposite Zealot teaching.'[1]

This, then, is the party of which we now propose to present a sketch. Who were the Zealots and what were their aims? What were the causes which originated the movement and fostered it for so long a time? And what were the chief incidents in its tragic history?

Our ' sources,' though not numerous, are sufficient for our purpose. These are: Josephus, *War* and *Antiquities* ; the New Testament, especially the Gospels ; the Apocryphal and Pseudepigraphical literature of the period ; Tacitus, *Historiae* and *Annales ;* Suetonius, *Vitae XII Imperatorum* ; Philo, *Leg. ad Gaium,* and *De Execrationibus.*

[1] *Stewardship of Faith,* pp. 18, 30.

Chapter II

NAME AND GENERAL CHARACTERISTICS

Names

The Zealots are known in history by three names: Cananaeans, Zealots, and, later, Sicarii, derived from Hebrew, Greek, and Latin sources respectively. The first two, Cananaeans[1] and Zealots,[2] are identical in meaning and signify the 'zeal' and 'fervour' with which the party pursued its aims. The last, Sicarii,[3] has a sinister significance. The Sicarii were men of the 'sica,' or dagger, and the word 'came to be employed to denote the baser and more fanatical associates of the Zealots, whose policy it was to eliminate their antagonists by assassination.'[4] Josephus says that the second was the name they applied to themselves.[5]

General Characteristics

For a general description of this party we may turn first of all to a few sentences in Josephus, though with the necessary reminder that his account is neither without bias nor freedom from error:

> 'Judas the Galilean was the author of the fourth sect of Jewish philosophy. Its pupils agree in all other things with the Pharisaic notions, but they have an inviolable attachment to liberty, and say that God is their only Ruler and Lord. They also do not mind dying any kinds of death, nor indeed do they heed the tortures of their relations and friends, nor can any such fear make them call any man

[1] From קנאניא (represented in Gr. by Καναναῖος), the plur. of קנאן, a later Heb. form from קנא, adj. jealous. Cananean is, of course, to be distinguished from Canaanite (an inhabitant of Canaan.

[2] From Gr. ὁ ζηλωτής, i e., one burning with zeal; cf. Luke vi. 15, Acts i. 13.

[3] From Gr. ὁ σικάριος, from Lat. *sica*, = a short, curved sword usually carried under the cloak; cf. Josephus, *War*, II. xvii. 6, &c.; Acts xxi. 38.

[4] *E. B.*, art. 'Assassins.'

[5] *War*, IV. iii. 9.

lord. And since this immovable resolution of theirs is well known to a great many, I shall speak no further about that matter; for I am not afraid that anything I have said of them should be disbelieved, but rather fear that what I have said comes short of the resolution they show when they undergo pain. And it was in Gessius Florus' time, who was our Procurator, that the nation began to suffer from this madness, for by the abuse of his authority he made the Jews go wild and revolt from the Romans.'

Again, he says:

'Zealots, for that was the name those audacious persons went by, as if they were zealous in good practices, and were not rather zealous and extravagant in the worst actions.'

Describing their conduct at a later stage, he adds:

'For they were zealous in every bad work, and if their memory recalled any evil thing that had formerly been done, they did not omit zealously to do the same; and yet they gave themselves their name as if zealous for what was good, either bantering those they treated ill because of their brutish disposition, or thinking of the greatest evils good. Accordingly they each had a fitting end, God awarding to them punishment completely adequate to their deserts.'[1]

A Party, Not a Sect

The Zealots, then, were a Jewish party, not a philosophic sect, as Josephus asserts, called into being by antagonism to the Roman domination in Palestine. And it would be difficult to exaggerate the importance of the part they played in the last century of Jewish national life. From the very outset, though the Romans were welcomed by some as promising a more stable Government, their rule was resented by the majority of the people. As time went on the humiliations and extortions of the foreign yoke became a burden intolerable to so proud a people. At an early stage a spirit of opposition was aroused and, unhappily, this smouldering fire was all too liberally supplied with combustibles by the subsequent mismanagement of the Roman

[1] *Ant.*, XVIII. i. 6; *War*, IV. iii. 9, VII. viii. 1.

procurators. After a time the malcontents formed themselves into a party, to which every new act of oppression brought fresh adherents. Irritated at the beginning by the subservience of their own ruler, Hyrcanus II, to his Roman overlord ; aghast at the savage oppression of the Idumaean Herod, the willing tool of any who wielded the Roman power ; the people were at last driven frantic by the galling injustice and tyranny of successive procurators whose administration was a direct challenge to rebellion. It soon became evident that the challenge would not be declined, and open rebellion on a national scale was only a matter of time. In the end the whole nation became involved in the struggle, but the head and front of the anti-Roman movement was the party of the Zealots, who became the stalwart, fearless, bitter, and unrelenting opponents of the foreign dominion.

The period covered by this party coincides with the Roman intervention and its subsequent government, i.e., it begins at or soon after Pompey's destruction of Jerusalem in 63 B.C., and culminates in the final destruction of the City and Temple in A.D. 70 by Titus. Certain remaining Zealot strongholds had indeed to be reduced before the Roman triumph could be declared effective throughout the whole land, but the party as such was destroyed in A.D. 70. The spirit of the Zealots, however, was even then not entirely dead, and the Jewish revolts under the Emperors Trajan[1] and Hadrian[2] revealed a potency which must have startled those who finally dealt with them.

Diverse Elements.

The party was composed of diverse elements : ' Its higher forces consisted of patriots, enthusiasts, and exalted visionaries ; but by its proclamation of war to the knife against Rome and every friend of Rome, Zealotism also enrolled under its standard a class of men who, in the guise of religion and patriotism, were playing the vulgar part of robbers and assassins.'[3] Probably those prudent men of the world, the Sadducees, kept aloof. They were too satisfied with their wealth, and the semblance of power granted them by the Romans, to care to hazard any sympathy with desperadoes whose aim and spirit were so

[1] A.D. 98–117.
[2] A.D. 117–138.
[3] Morrison, *Jews under the Romans*, p. 127.

different from theirs. But with the Pharisees it was different. The presence of the pagan intruders in the land, and especially in the Holy City, increased the danger of ceremonial uncleanness, and it must have needed considerable restraint to prevent them from casting discretion to the winds and joining the party of resistance and revenge. Towards the end, at any rate, many of the more enthusiastic did actually join hands with the revolters. 'The Pharisees . . . never disapproved of their conduct until it degenerated into absolutely unlawful proceedings. Where this happened the Doctors of the Pharisees broke loose from the Zealots, who now betrayed their connexion with the Pharisees by immediately falling upon the Sadducean aristocracy.'[1]

Failure and Cruelties

The common opinion of the movement is undoubtedly adverse, and certainly if success is to be the chief criterion of judgement this is not to be wondered at. For they failed, and in their failure brought down about their ears the whole structure of the Jewish State. But there is more than this to be said. It is inevitable that this movement should be compared with the Maccabean. Both were revolts against foreign oppression and both brought upon the nation a terrible period of struggle. But whereas the earlier conflict achieved brilliant success, the latter was overwhelmed in disastrous failure. The sufficient explanation of the different results is to be found in the fact that while the Maccabees had only to contend with Antiochus Epiphanes—who though formidable enough was not invincible to united opposition—the Zealots, on the other hand, opposed themselves to the inexhaustible might of Rome. Under no imaginable circumstances, as we can see now, could they have succeeded, and patriots though they were they ought to have seen this at the time. But the general condemnation of the Zealots is not based solely on the fanaticism of their enterprise. This might have been forgiven. But their wild ferocity, amounting at times to sheer madness, impelling them not only to the butchery of the common foe, but even to the massacre of any of their fellow-countrymen who disagreed with them, is an inevitable blot which even success could not have wiped out.

[1] Siefert, *P. R. E.*³, xv. 287.

Chapter III

THE ROMAN GOVERNMENT AND THE JEWS

In looking for the causes of the Zealot movement one soon perceives that they were twofold: outer and inner; outer, in the sense of being due in part to the nature of the Government under which the people were obliged to live; inner, because their resistance to this was largely influenced by certain beliefs and aspirations peculiar to themselves. The latter will be dealt with in the next chapter. Here we propose to look at the former, restricting ourselves, however, to the fundamental and inevitable features of this Government, and leaving the superficial and incidental, though none the less irritating, features until the actual progress of the movement comes to be narrated.

Contact between the Romans and the Jews seems to have commenced in the second century B.C. About 162 B.C. Judas Maccabeus, probably through fear of his Syrian foes, made 'a league of amity and confederacy' with the Romans.[1] Though the details of this incident in 1 Maccabees may be unreliable, there is no sufficient reason for doubting that an embassy was actually sent to Rome and a treaty concluded.[2] Again, in 143 B.C., Jonathan, brother and successor of Judas, 'chose men and sent them to Rome, to confirm and renew the friendship that they had with them.'[3] When Simon came to the throne the Romans of their own accord 'wrote unto him on tablets of brass, to renew with him the friendship and the confederacy which they had established with Judas and Jonathan, his brethren.'[4] Once again, in 129 B.C., John Hyrcanus, son and successor of Simon, sought and secured a renewal of this friendship.[5]

If it be asked how it came to pass that the powerful 'Roman Senate and People' should thus enter into treaty-relations

[1] 1 Macc. viii. 17; *Ant.*, XII. x. 6. [2] So Wellhausen and others.
[3] 1 Macc. xii. 1. [4] 1 Macc. xiv. 17 f. [5] *Ant.*, XIII. ix. 2.

with so insignificant a nation as the Jews, the answer is not far to seek. It suited their Eastern policy to do so. Rome entertained great ambitions in regard to the East. Already Syria, Pergamus, and Rhodes had felt the weight of her power, and any friendship or association which promised to hinder or retard reversion to the former conditions was welcomed. So when Syria attempted to extend her borders at the expense of Palestine, the Jews' appeal for the protection of Rome met with ready response. And, though no military aid was forthcoming, her emphatic veto proved sufficient to save the little nation from absorption by their Northern neighbours.

This semi-alliance continued until 63 B.C., that is, until it suited the Romans to put it aside. It is sometimes asserted that the Jews had only themselves to thank for the loss of their independence, but this is only partially true. They did, indeed, precipitate and even invite intervention, but it would have happened in any case. For after a period of necessary absorption in events nearer home, the Romans were set free to give their attention again to Eastern affairs, and it was inevitable that Pompey, having subjugated Syria, should turn his face southwards. Unfortunately for the Jews this occurred at the moment when internal faction left them at their weakest and utterly at the mercy of the invader. The history of the struggle between the Pharisees and Sadducees has already been told, and one need only recall the fact that in 63 B.C. the feud had plunged the nation into the throes of civil war. On Pompey's approach deputations representing the rival parties appeared before him, inviting his arbitration and support.[1] The Roman general accepted the position of arbiter with alacrity, but executed it in a way the suppliants neither expected nor desired. Soon Jerusalem was besieged and captured and the Jews found themselves placed under Roman domination, a domination which, while varying in character, was maintained until the final disappearance of the Jewish State in A.D. 70.

From 63 B.C. to A.D. 6 the people were under Jewish or semi-Jewish rulers who were subordinate to Rome. From A.D. 6 onwards the land was merely one of the many Roman Provinces.

[1] *War*, I. vi. 3 f.

I. From 63 B.C. to A.D. 6 a Client State

Rome's 'allies sank into clients and her clients into subjects. Thus Israel was made an ally of Rome by Judas Maccabaeus (162 B.C.) and became a client state when Pompeius took Jerusalem (63 B.C.)'[1] Aristobulus was deposed, and Hyrcanus, his brother, permitted to retain the office of high-priest, but all real political power was placed in the hands of the Idumaean Antipater, who in his turn was subject to the Roman Governor of Syria through whom the taxes were paid.[2]

In consequence of attempts made by Aristobulus and his two sons to recover the kingdom (four were made in five years), Gabinius, the Syrian pro-consul, forthwith destroyed the remaining strongholds and divided the country into five districts with different local governments. The intention and effect of this was to diminish the importance and dangerousness of Jerusalem. Caesar, however, who was indebted to the Jews for help during his Egyptian campaign, repaid them by granting certain valuable concessions. The arrangement of Gabinius was abolished, Hyrcanus was given the title of Ethnarch, and Antipater was appointed Governor of Judea. In addition the people were freed from dues, military occupation, and the levy.[3] It is easy to see, however, that so far as Hyrcanus was concerned the new dignity was merely nominal, the real authority being in the hands of Antipater. The position of the Sanhedrin was also, like that of Hyrcanus, with whom it was supposed to act, unreal. On one memorable occasion it forgot this, and attempted to call to account Antipater's son Herod for his summary execution of the Galilaean arch-robber Ezechias. But when the young man appeared in Jerusalem, in response to their summons, he was accompanied by an armed force, and was with difficulty restrained by his father from using it to teach the Sanhedrin its true place in the government of the country.[4]

There were of course, many real benefits accruing to the people from the new régime, chief among them being the cessation of faction strife, and the consequent tranquillity necessary to the pursuit of agricultural and commercial undertakings. But the pride of the nation was wounded at the thought of

[1] Gwatkin, *Early Church History*, i., p. 29.
[2] Cf. Lagrange, *Le Messianisme*, p. 10.
[3] Cf. Mommsen, *Prov. R. E.*, ii. 175, *n.* [4] *Ant.*, xiv. ix. 3–5; *War*, i. x. 6–9.

subordination to a foreign power. Not many years before, the writer of 1 Maccabees had described the glories of the Maccabean rule in glowing terms:

> 'And they tilled their land in peace, and the land gave her increase, and the trees of the plains their fruit. Old men sat in the streets, they communed all of them together of good things, and the young men put on glorious and warlike apparel. He (i.e. Simon) provided victuals for the cities, and furnished them with defensive works until his glorious name was proclaimed unto the end of the earth. He made peace in the land and Israel rejoiced with great joy. And they sat each man under his vine and his fig-tree, and there was none to make them afraid; and there ceased in the land any that fought against them, and the kings were discomfited in those days. And he strengthened all those of his people who were brought low; the Law he searched out, and every lawless and wicked person he took away. And the vessels of the Temple he multiplied.'[1]

This idyllic time had now passed, and the contrast made them bitter. Nor was their bitterness due to fallen pride only. Crassus, the successor of Gabinius, in 54 B.C., seized the Temple treasures, and shortly afterwards Cassius imposed heavy taxation on the people to pay his soldiers, and sold into slavery those who refused payment.

Herod's Domination

A revolution broke out in 40 B.C., and so far succeeded that the son of the deposed Aristobulus occupied the throne for three years, but Herod, who had been nominated by the Romans, overthrew the victors after a protracted struggle and assumed the royal power. His position was that of a feudatory king (his title '*rex socius*'), and throughout his long reign he showed remarkable dexterity in retaining the friendship of his masters, and equally remarkable resolution in defeating the sleepless enmity of large numbers of his subjects. Any one who threatened to cross his path was ruthlessly removed. An elaborate spy system, mercenaries, and innumerable murders were among the weapons he employed to make his position

[1] 1 Macc. xiv. 8–15.

secure. In other respects there is much in Herod's reign to admire. It was distinguished by the erection of many noble buildings, the extinction of brigandage, the advancement of commerce, adequate defence of the frontiers against marauders, and financial help to the people in the time of famine.

But it is evident that he despised the people he governed, and this evoked fear and hatred in return. If in some matters he showed respect for their religious principles and ceremonial scruples, as, for instance, in arranging that priests only should build the inner portion of the new Temple and in refraining from entering it himself,[1] he offended them deeply by his enthusiastic devotion to Hellenism, his erection of theatres and amphitheatres, making race-courses, planning games, accommodating men of Hellenic extraction at his Court and appointing them to important positions; by heavy taxation; by arbitrary appointment and deposition of high-priests; by the erection of a golden eagle over the great gate of the Temple; and, fundamentally, by the unalterable fact that he, their ruler, was not a Jew.

At the very outset he retaliated on the Sadducean nobility for their opposition to his appointment by slaying forty-five of their number, with the result that the whole Sadducean party regarded him thereafter with implacable hostility. The Sanhedrin, the glory of the nation, was denuded of any real influence. Even the Pharisees, predisposed to turn aside from political strife, could only teach the people to look upon Herod as a divine judgement for their sins to which they must for the moment submit themselves. The allegations made by a Jewish embassy at Rome following Herod's death, after all deductions for possible exaggerations represent a terrible state of affairs even for those days:

> 'They said Herod had never ceased adding to the beauty of those neighbouring cities that were inhabited by foreigners, but the cities belonging to his own kingdom were ruined and utterly destroyed; and whereas, when he took the kingdom, it was in an extraordinarily flourishing condition, he had afflicted the nation with extreme poverty, and when he had slain any of the nobility upon unjust pretexts, he had taken away their estates, and when he permitted any

[1] *Ant.*, xv. xi. 5 f.

of them to live, he had condemned them to the forfeiture of what they possessed. And, besides the annual impositions which he laid upon every one of them, they had had to make liberal presents to him and his domestics and friends, and to such of his slaves as were vouchsafed the favour of being his tax-gatherers, because there was no way of obtaining freedom from unjust violence, without giving either gold or silver for it. They would say nothing of the deflowering of their virgins, or the debauching of their wives, and that carried out in a wanton and inhuman manner, because it was almost equal pleasure to the sufferers to have such things concealed as not to have suffered them. They said Herod had ill-treated them worse than a wild beast would have done, if he had power given him to rule; and although their nation had passed through many vicissitudes and changes, their history gave no account of any calamity it had ever undergone, that could be compared with what Herod had brought upon the nation.'[1]

Little is known of the reign of Archelaus, Herod's son.[2] But apparently it was not materially different from that of his father. In personal character he was violent and arbitrary, and his marriage with his sister-in-law, Glaphyra, while her second husband was still living, was a grievous offence against Jewish law. Rebellions broke out and thousands were slain or crucified. After nine years he was deposed and his ethnarchy became at last a Roman province.[3]

II. From A.D. 6 a Roman Province

When the Jewish deputation reached Rome after Herod's death they asked the Emperor for direct Roman government:

'They concluded by saying that the main thing they desired was that they might be delivered from kingly and similar governments, and might be added to Syria, and be put under the authority of such chief magistrates as should be sent to them; for it would thereby be made evident whether they were really rebellious people, and generally fond of innovations, or whether they would live in an orderly manner, if they had mild rulers set over them.'[4]

[1] *Ant.*, XVII. xi. 2.

[2] 4 B.C.–A.D. 6. His territory included Judea, Samaria, and Idumea.

[3] For a Jewish estimate of Archelaus, cf. *Ant.*, XVII. xi. 2.

[4] *Ant.*, XVII. xi. 2.

But their request was for the time refused, and Archelaus appointed Ethnarch. About nine years later the appeal was renewed, reinforced by the misdemeanours of the new ruler. This time it succeeded, Archelaus was banished, and his dominion entered upon its career as a Roman province. High hopes were entertained by the unhappy people of larger liberty and freedom from local oppression, but they had reckoned without the Roman procurators. Yet it would be incorrect to regard Rome herself as an intentional oppressor in any part of her vast domain. Within the limits imposed by her determination to be supreme it was her policy to conciliate those whom she had conquered. Unfortunately, however, her representatives were not always as wise and conciliatory as she was herself, and time after time they wantonly and grossly irritated the Jews, many of whom, it must be admitted, were on the outlook for offences.

The provinces were, at this time, administered either by the Senate or the Emperor, and hence called Senatorial or Imperial. The latter comprised those which were disaffected, or only partially Romanized, and were found on the outskirts of the Empire. Consequently a larger military force was needed to keep the peace and sustain the administration. Judea was a province of this type, and because of its comparative unimportance the Imperial representative was only of equestrian rank. Apparently the proconsul of Syria, being a Governor of higher rank, had the right to intervene in its affairs should difficulty arise, though this is denied by Mommsen.[1] In the exercise of this power Pilate was ordered back to Rome by Vitellius, and Cumanus by Ummidius Quadratus.[2]

The Procurators

The Procurators[3] represented the Roman authority in military, financial, and judicial affairs. The official residence was at Caesarea, which thus became the seat of the administration. On the occasion of the national festivals the Procurator went up to Jerusalem to keep the peace among the vast, surging crowds

[1] *Prov. R. E.*, ii. p. 175, *n.*

[2] Cf. *Ant.*, xvii. xiii. 5, xviii. iv. 2, xx. vi. 2 f.; *Tac. An.*, vi. 32, xii. 54.

[3] A Latin word; Gr. *ἐπίτροπος* and in the New Testament *ἡγεμών*; Josephus employs both words.

which gathered there. The largest body of troops was naturally at Caesarea, others being stationed at Jerusalem and various provincial centres. At festival-time the garrison at Jerusalem was considerably augmented. In addition to maintaining law and order within the land, the army had to safeguard the desert frontier. The procurators were at first changed annually, but Tiberius extended the apppointments in some cases for several years. And, to take away the temptation to extortion, he allowed them definite salaries. Despite this, however, the administration was marked by corruption and self-seeking, and often little consideration was given to the national and religious scruples of the governed.

Taxation was of two kinds: imperial and local. The imperial taxes, inevitable now that the national defence fell upon the Government, were collected by the procurator through the Jewish authorities. The local taxes were farmed out to the publicani (τελῶν ι), who in turn sub-let them to sub-ordinates. The procurator fixed the sum to be remitted by the publicani, and whatever they collected above this amount became their own—a system which lent itself to the abuses referred to in the Gospels.[1]

> 'The taxes consisted partly of a proportion of the produce of the soil which was paid either in kind or in money, but they included also a poll-tax, which was levied even on women and slaves. . . . Taking all these dues together, we see that the material resources of this little nation were drawn upon to an extraordinary degree, and that none but a very energetic and temperately living people could have borne such burdens, and upon the whole even prospered under them.'[2]

Evidence of the seriousness of these burdens is afforded by Tacitus, who not only informs us in one passage that the provinces 'of Syria and Judea, exhausted by their burdens, implored a reduction of tribute,' but in another plainly records the abuses which prevailed and the steps taken by the Emperor to remove them.[3]

[1] Cf. Luke xix. 8; Matt. ix. 10 f. [2] Buhl, *N. T. Times*, *H. D. B.*, *Ext.*, p. 52a.
[3] *Tac. An.*, ii. 42, and vi. 16 f.

In accordance with their custom the Romans handed over the local government to the leaders of the Jewish people, i.e. to the Sanhedrin (which in Herod's time had been almost crushed out of existence), and the local synagogues. Except in the case of capital punishment, which required the procurator's sanction,[1] the entire administration was in the hands of the Sanhedrin with the high-priest at its head. In addition, this body occupied the position of a Court of Justice, making its own laws, seizing offenders, and, with the exception just mentioned, punishing the guilty.[2]

Religious Tolerance

In the matter of religion the Government was tolerant, but with limitations, no unauthorized religion being permitted. It was a great concession to Jewish prejudice that Emperor-worship, which had become the vogue throughout the Empire, was not imposed upon the nation. The Emperor was, however, represented at the Temple twice a day by offerings sent on his behalf; but this was apparently regarded by the people as more of a concession to him than a favour to themselves. For, when the civil war broke out, the Zealots immediately discontinued the practice. Apart from Pompey's ill-considered act, when in 63 B.C. he outraged public feeling by entering the Holy of Holies, the sanctity of the Temple was acknowledged, and not even a Roman citizen was permitted to enter the sacred place on penalty of death. Several other concessions were made: the sacred vestments worn by the high-priest at religious festivals were after some trouble handed over to the custody of the Temple dignitaries; the Roman soldiers were forbidden to carry their standards into Jerusalem because they bore the Emperor's image; even the shields, though they had no image on them, were removed out of the city because they were an offence to the religious susceptibilities of the people. Such conspicuous deference to the sensitiveness of a conquered nation is evidence enough of the peaceable intentions of the Supreme Government. Over against this, however, it has to be recorded that in their treatment of the high-priestly office the procurators gave the gravest offence. The high-priest was the centre and soul of the nation's life. But as long as

[1] John xviii. 31. [2] Cf. Matt. xxvi. 47; Acts. v. 21.

the appointment remained in the hands of the procurators, appointments and depositions succeeded each other according to the whim or interest of the civil ruler. Office was often simply sold to the highest bidder, and the successful competitors recouped themselves without regard to right or law. Thus what had been the nation's pride and glory now became the cause of its shame and indignation.[1]

[1] Cf. *Ant.*, xx. x; Graetz, *H. J.*, ii. p. 237 f.

Chapter IV

THE MESSIANIC HOPE

Whether the political and economic conditions just described would have sufficed of themselves to produce the Zealot outbreak it is impossible to say. As a matter of fact, however, the natural and just resentment against these was immeasurably reinforced by what is compendiously referred to as the 'Messianic Hope.' So potent did this become between the invasion of Pompey (in 63 B.C.) and the destruction of Jerusalem (in A.D. 70), and such was its content, that it is hardly too much to say that even the best possible conditions which yet left the people subordinate to a foreign power would not have availed to avert rebellion. As many writers have acknowledged, the Zealot movement was at its core religious in spirit, however questionable some of its methods. 'Its deepest root,' says Kuenen, 'lies in the Jewish religion and in the influence which it necessarily had upon the people.' 'All who uprightly professed that religion were convinced in their hearts that in this capacity they had a right, first of all to liberty, and therefore to the recognition of their privileges and to the dominion which in their minds was inseparable from it.'[1] So, too, Morrison: 'The hope of being ultimately rescued from Roman rule was based upon the belief that the Jews were Jehovah's chosen race. . . . The end was at hand; the brilliant promises of God would soon be fulfilled. The stranger would be trodden down; Israel would be consoled, and the Messianic Kingdom with its centre at Jerusalem would suddenly burst on the world.'[2] A perusal of the literature belonging to this period shows how deep and widespread was this expectation of a Messianic Kingdom. In the long course of its development it had naturally varied greatly both in content and intensity. In earlier times the hope was more general and

[1] *Relig. of Israel*, iii. 271 f. [2] *Jews under the Romans*, p. 363.

contemplated mainly material good; and it is often doubtful whether the Deliverer would be Jehovah Himself, or some human representative.[1] It also varied from time to time in intensity. In prosperity the people became satisfied and their forward look was dim; in adversity they became discontented and the hope grew strong again. Thus in the period immediately preceding the present, when the Maccabees threw off the Syrian yoke and secured first the headship of the nation and, later, the high-priesthood as well, it seemed to the pious Jew that the long-hoped-for days of blessedness had actually arrived, and that nothing was left to desire or hope for. In some of the literature of the time the traditional idea of the Messianic descent from Judah was abandoned and a descent from Levi substituted, thus identifying the Messianic era with the Levitical Maccabees.[2] But this period of satisfaction did not last long. The Maccabean rulers flattered only to deceive, and in deep disappointment the minds of the more devout reverted to the old hope and with a yearning all the greater because of the deception they had suffered.[3] The literature which arose after the Romans came tells the story best.

I. Psalms of Solomon

Our first witness is the volume containing the so-called Psalms of Solomon, which may be assigned to the period between 70 and 40 B.C.[4] Some of these eighteen psalms express the deep sense of outrage evoked by the terrible events of 63 B.C. when Pompey invaded the land, desecrated the Temple, and carried away many of the people as captives. The Pharisaic writer (or writers) is absorbed in the awful fate which had come upon Jerusalem, due largely to the sinners in their midst (a reference probably to the Sadducees), but is nevertheless confident that God's mercy will return in due time in response to penitence. In any case deliverance cannot come from ordinary sources. 'The Lord is King' is his watchword, and He will send His Messiah to deliver His people.

The 17th and 18th Psalms are largely concerned with the anticipated victories of the Messiah. He will drive out the Gentiles from the land; the dispersed tribes will again be

[1] Cf. Schürer, *Jewish People, &c.*, II. ii., pp. 129 ff.
[2] Cf. *Test. Patr. Reub.*, vi. 7–12; *Levi*, viii. 14; *Jud.* xxiv. 1 ff., &c.
[3] *Vide* further pt. I., chap. vi. (ii.); also Bousset's *Relig. des Jud.*, III. iii.
[4] So R. H. Charles; Viteau makes the limits 69–47 B.C.

brought home and welded into a new and better unity ; He will also restore Jerusalem and the Temple, and all nations will be subject to Him. A few lines may be quoted to illustrate the tenor of the Psalmist's confident message :

'Behold, O Lord, and raise up unto them their King, the Son of David ;
At the time in which Thou seest, O God, that He may reign over Israel Thy servant,
And gird Him with strength, that He may shatter unrighteous rulers,
And that He may purge Jerusalem from nations that trample (her) down to destruction.
Wisely, righteously He shall thrust out the sinners from (the) inheritance,
He shall destroy the pride of the sinner as a potter's vessel.
With a rod of iron He shall break in pieces all their substance,
He shall destroy the godless nations with the word of His mouth ;
At His rebuke nations shall flee before Him,
And He shall reprove sinners for the thoughts of their heart.
. . . . . .
All nations shall be in fear before Him,
For He will smite the earth with the word of His mouth for ever,
He will bless the people of the Lord with wisdom and gladness,
And He Himself (will be) pure from sin, so that He may rule a great people.
He will rebuke rulers and remove sinners by the might of His word ;
And (relying) upon His God, throughout His days will not stumble ;
For God will make Him mighty by means of (His) holy spirit,
And wise by means of the spirit of understanding, with strength and righteousness.'[1]

It will be noted that the Messiah expected by the Psalmist, is a *person* ; and, if Daniel vii. be omitted, it is the first time in Palestinian literature that this has been plainly asserted. He

[1] Ps. Sol. xvii. 23–27, 38–42.

would also be of the royal House of David—a reversion to the traditional belief. His titles are: King,[1] King of Israel,[2] King of the Jews,[3] Son of David,[4] Christ,[5] and Saviour.[6] Though His victory over His foes is to be complete, His weapons and methods are wholly spiritual, not carnal. 'The Psalmist is not a fanatic in presence of the evils which are ruining his country; "he does not preach war *à outrance* against the pagan, and he does not appeal for insurrection against the party of the sinners." Deliverance cannot come from the earth; the author looks to heaven.'[7] Nevertheless the blessings which are to follow the Messianic advent are almost entirely of a material nature, and the great Hope falls to a lower level than in the earlier words of Enoch.

This, then, was the confident expectation of the Psalmist. He courageously maintained a hope of better days to be brought about by the spiritual weapons of a Messiah sent from on high. How such thoughts affected men of a more ordinary patriotic type, less scrupulous than he as to methods if only the end were attained, we shall see later. 'Henceforward the doctrine of the Messiah is at once the centre of popular hope and the object of theological culture.'[8]

II. Fragments of a Zadokite Work

Next in historical sequence is a small volume to which the name of *Fragments of a Zadokite Work* has been given, and which has only recently come to light. The honour of discovering it in the Genizah of Cairo belongs to Schechter. His annotated edition, which was published as recently as 1910, shows that there exist two MSS., one belonging probably to the tenth century, and the other, which is very incomplete, to the eleventh or twelfth century.

Already many writers have expressed their views on this important little document; but no general agreement has been reached either as to its original date or to the place in history occupied by the party whose views it expresses. We can only use it, therefore, with hesitation and after plain acknowledgement of this uncertainty. The date of the original writing is

[1] xvii. 35 f. [2] xvii. 23, 47. [3] xvii. 23. [4] xvii. 23.
[5] xvii. 36, xviii. 6. [6] xvii. 36. [7] Viteau, *Ps. Sol.*, p. 68.
[8] W. R. Smith, art. 'Messiah,' *E. Brit.*, 9th ed., xvi. 56a.

one of the points in dispute, but R. H. Charles is strongly disposed to assign it to 18–8 B.C.[1] The writer seems to be a member of a reformed and reforming section of the Sadducean party.

Its subject-matter is both interesting and striking. The writer is concerned with the sins of Israel, more especially those of the Pharisees, a party which he attacks throughout. Yet he has great hope in God. Already God has sent them a 'Star' and a 'Teacher of Righteousness' to lead and instruct the 'penitents,' and now the party await with confidence the coming of the Messiah.

> 'And through His Messiah He shall make them know His holy spirit.'[2]
>
> . . . . . .
>
> 'And "they that give heed unto Him are the poor of the flock." These shall escape during the period of visitation, but the rest shall be handed over to the sword when the Messiah comes from Aaron and Israel.'[3]

The writer seems to be little concerned with foreign offenders, finding the source and fount of all the miseries of the time in the sins of the Jews, against whom God will turn His anger and vengeance. His expectation of the Messiah appears to point to His early appearance. This is seen in the fact that the Messiah is to spring from Aaron and Israel—a puzzling statement. Charles's ingenious explanation is that this refers to a son of Mariamne and Herod the Great. Mariamne was a daughter of the priestly and royal House of the Maccabees, and so represented the Aaronic descent; and Herod claimed to be at least half a Jew, and so may be said to represent Israel. For a pious and reforming Jew, keenly alive even to the sins of Pharisees, to look to Alexander or Aristobulus as the Lord's Messiah may appear to indicate despair rather than hope, but it at any rate presents a striking testimony to the intensity, invincibility, and immediacy of the Messianic Expectation.[4]

III. THE ASSUMPTION OF MOSES, perhaps better styled *The Testament of Moses*

This is a book of peculiar interest both on account of its

[1] For his argument *vide Apoc. and Ps.*, ii. 787 f. [2] ii. 10.
[3] ix. 10b. [4] For full discussion of this document, *vide Apoc. and Ps.*, ii. 785 ff.

probable date and because of its standpoint in regard to the Messianic hope. R. H. Charles places it between A.D. 7 and 29, Schürer at the beginning of the Christian era. It was at any rate written near, or during the lifetime of Jesus Christ, and it adds no little to our interest in it to suppose that He may have been acquainted with it. Like the authors of *Enoch*, the *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*, and the *Psalms of Solomon*, the unknown author eagerly anticipates the coming of the Kingdom of God, but strangely enough makes no mention of a Messiah.

The work is Apocalyptic in character, the speaker supposed to be Moses, and the historical standpoint just before his death. Addressing Joshua, so soon to take his place, Moses is represented as seeing prophetically the whole future course of his people's history up to the time of the actual writer, and especially the evils and misfortunes which will overtake them. Thus he anticipates the Chaldean invasion and captivity of the sixth century B.C. ; the attempt by Antiochus Epiphanes to stamp out the nation's religious distinctiveness in the second century B.C. ; the mistaken and wicked assumption of the high-priestly office by the Maccabees ; the humiliating government of the Idumaean Herod, and finally the complete subjugation by the Romans. Yet this depressing survey does not daunt the courageous seer, and he encourages Joshua by pointing out how deliverance will come in each event. Daniel's prayers will bring about the Return from Babylon ; the Syrian oppression will be frustrated by the pious heroism of men like Eleazar and the seven sons who resolved to ' die rather than transgress the commands of the Lord of Lords, the God of our fathers. For if we do this and die, our blood shall be avenged before the Lord.'[1] But no mention is made of the military exploits of the Maccabees, whose deeds now belong to the heroic history of the world. The writer seems to have no sympathy with carnal weapons of warfare. The virtues he commends are pious repentance for the sins which brought about their calamities and patient endurance of God's judgements until the divine deliverance should arrive. This deliverance is certain to come, and Israel's faith in God will be abundantly justified.

[1] *Assump. of Moses*, ix. 6, 7.

'Then, thou, O Israel, shalt be happy,
And thou shalt mount upon the necks and wings of the eagle,
And they shall be ended.
And God will exalt thee,
And He will cause thee to approach to the heaven of the stars,
In the place of their habitation.
And thou shalt look from on high and see thine enemies in Gehenna,
And thou shalt recognize them and rejoice,
And thou shalt give thanks and confess thy Creator.'[1]

The final injunction of Moses to Joshua breathes the same spirit:

> 'Those, therefore, who do and fulfil the commandments of God shall increase and be prospered; but those who sin and set at naught the commandments shall be without the blessings before mentioned, and they shall be punished with many torments by the nations. But wholly to root out and destroy them is not permitted.'[2]

Here then we have the point of view of one who is confronted by the injustices and humiliations of the Roman government in the early years of the first Christian century, and the violent attempts then being made to remove them. Israel's enemies shall be overthrown in the present as in the past, and the power shall be God's not man's. The Angel Michael 'shall forthwith avenge them of their enemies,'[3] but no mention is made of a Messiah, human or divine. 'This is probably due,' suggests R. H. Charles, 'to the fact that the conception of the Messiah as a man of war was gaining more and more acceptance amongst the Pharisees, and was thus of a nature to promote the growing secularization of Pharisaism. No such Messiah could be acknowledged by our author.'[4]

In face of all this it seems more than a little strange that so many writers should regard the writer as a Zealot. Yet this is the view of Ewald, Dillmann, Schürer, Wieseler, Rosenthal, and De Faye. On the other hand Charles, Burkitt, Zenos, and others, properly regard him as one who viewed

[1] *Assump. of Moses*, x. 8–10.
[2] Ibid., xii. 10–12.
[3] x. 2.
[4] *Apoc. and Ps.*, ii., p. 412.

with grave concern the rise of the Zealot movement, and set himself to oppose it.

IV. New Testament

Though the Gospels and Acts of the Apostles belong to the second half of the first century, they constitute the most important body of evidence extant for the Messianic hopes of those who lived in the first three decades of that century. Their general value is enhanced by the fact that they reveal not only the views of the leaders of the people, but those of the multitude too. Wherever Jesus went in Judea, in Samaria, or in Galilee, we find men discussing the possibility of His being the Messiah as a matter of urgent public interest. It was obviously not a matter in which the schools and the élite of the nation alone were concerned, but a matter of common talk in all the towns and villages of the land. It is not necessary to attempt an exhaustive survey of this evidence, but two points ought to be made clear, viz. that the Messianic expectation was widespread, and that in some cases it comprised elements of a revolutionary character.

(*a*) *Existence of a Widespread Messianic Expectation*

We may begin with the words uttered by the aged Simeon and Anna[1] when they saw the Infant Jesus brought by His parents to the Temple at Jerusalem. Simeon had been 'looking for the consolation of Israel,' and the sight of the child filled him with contentment, 'for mine eyes have seen Thy salvation which Thou hast prepared before the face of all peoples; a light for revelation to the Gentiles, and the glory of Thy people Israel.' Anna also 'gave thanks unto God and spake of Him to all them that were looking for the redemption of Jerusalem.' Evidently there were many present bearing in their hearts the same hope, though slower than they to discern its approaching realization.

With these testimonies from the centre of Jewish life one may compare the words of the Samaritan woman in the country: 'I know that Messiah cometh,'[2] simply spoken as if the anticipation were a commonplace. And to these may be joined the brief description of Joseph of Arimathea, 'who also himself was looking for the Kingdom of God.'[3]

[1] Luke ii. 22–38. [2] John iv. 25. [3] Mark xv. 43; Luke xxiii. 51.

The message and immediate success of John the Baptist are significant of the preoccupation of the public mind. 'Repent ye,' he cried, 'for the Kingdom of Heaven is at hand.'[1] And to prevent any misconception of his meaning, he continued: 'There cometh after me He that is mightier than I, the latchet of whose shoes I am not worthy to stoop down and unloose.'[2] The response was general. Multitudes from Jerusalem, Judea, and the region of the Jordan sought his baptism so that they might be prepared for the Advent of the Messiah. Some even wondered whether John himself might not be the Expected One.[3] And if John's later question to Jesus, sent from the depressing prison: 'Art thou He that cometh or look we for another?'[4] reveals a passing uncertainty as to Jesus, it does nothing to minimize his conviction of the imminence of the Messiah's approach.

At one of the feasts at Jerusalem, a discussion is reported to have taken place among the multitude about the claims of Jesus, whether He was 'the prophet' or actually 'the Christ' Himself.[5] We are also told of Jesus questioning the people concerning the interpretation of a Messianic problem which was perhaps under discussion just then in the schools, and which is 'a criticism of the Messianic teaching of the Rabbis'[6]: 'How say the Scribes that the Christ is the Son of David?'[7] Even in remote Galilee, where if anywhere one might expect to find indifference to such a matter, two blind men hail Jesus as the Son of David.[8] Preceding Peter's great confession, we are told of the various conjectures of the people as to the identity of Jesus, and among them is one identifying Him with Elijah the prophet whose return was to herald the Messiah.[9] With this is naturally associated the conversation between Jesus and His disciples after the Transfiguration, showing that the disciples' minds were also exercised with the same problem.[10]

The question put to Jesus at His trial by Pilate should also be noted: 'Art thou the King of the Jews?'[11] Even the Roman Procurator seems to have heard of this expectation and its association with Jesus. It had evidently become a matter

[1] Matt. iii. 2. [2] Mark i. 7. [3] Luke iii. 15.
[4] Matt. xi. 3; Luke vii. 19. [5] John vii. 41. [6] Gould, *I. C. C. Mark*, p. 234.
[7] Mark xii. 35–37, and par. [8] Matt. ix. 27. [9] Mark viii. 28, and par.
[10] Mark ix. 11; Matt. xvii. 10. [11] Mark xv. 2, and par.

of common report. And, of course, if Jesus were the King of the Jews, He was the Messiah! Any other kind of kingship was an impossible supposition.

The pathetic story of the two disappointed disciples journeying to Emmaus reveals the real character of their disappointment: 'But we hoped that it was He which should redeem Israel.'[1] And in this they were expressing the thought of the whole disciple band. These instances are sufficient to show how general the Messianic expectation was.

(*b*) *Revolutionary Elements*

Of the presence of revolutionary elements in this expectation indications are to be found here and there. How otherwise are we to interpret the actions and words of the multitude which accompanied Jesus from the Mount of Olives to Jerusalem?[2] The words shouted from time to time were highly significant: 'Hosanna; Blessed is He that cometh in the name of the Lord: Blessed is the Kingdom that cometh, the Kingdom of our father David: Hosanna in the highest.'[3] The incident is no mere idyll, the pardonable exuberance of provincials as they conduct their hero to the capital. Rather is it the outburst of a long pent-up but unconquerable hope that the day of Messianic deliverance is at hand.

The well-known eschatological passage in the Synoptic Gospels[4] may contain, as is suggested by many, a Jewish Christian Apocalypse, but it is generally allowed that the grave warning of Jesus in regard to false Messiahs is genuine. 'And then if any man shall say unto you, Lo, here is the Christ; or, Lo, there; believe it not; for there shall arise false Christs and false prophets, and shall show signs and wonders, that they may lead astray, if possible, the elect. But take ye heed, behold, I have told you all things beforehand.'[5] Taken in association with current events it is a passage of sinister significance.

But even the disciples themselves seemed to share the common presentiment of an approaching catastrophe before the work of the Messiah could be accomplished. One of themselves, Simon, was known as the Zealot.[6] And even subsequent to the Resurrection the disciples asked Jesus:

[1] Luke xxiv. 21. [2] Mark xi. 1–10, and par. [3] Mark xi. 9 f.
[4] Mark xiii. 1–37, and par.
[5] Mark xiii. 21–23; cf. Matt. xxiv. 5, 11; Luke xxi. 8. [6] Luke vi. 15.

'Lord, dost Thou at this time restore the Kingdom to Israel?'[1] Despite all the teaching they had received, and the temporary disillusionment of the Crucifixion, the minds of His most intimate followers were still intently fixed on the expected overthrow of the Roman power. Of the insurrections of Theudas, of Judas of Galilee, and of the Egyptian,[2] only passing mention need be made here, as they will be referred to later. But there is possibly a further suggestion of this Messianic unrest in the words of Jesus when uttering His eulogy of John the Baptist: 'And from the days of John the Baptist until now the Kingdom of Heaven suffereth violence, and men of violence take it by force.'[3] The allusion may refer, as some suppose, to the enthusiasm with which tax-gatherers and sinners were entering the Kingdom of God; but on the other hand it may point to the violence of the Zealots in their attempt to realize the common Messianic expectation.

V. Philo Judaeus

It is more than a coincidence, surely, that Philo Judaeus, the great Alexandrian scholar, should have been occupying himself at this time with thoughts and anticipations concerning the deliverance of his race. He was more of a recluse than a man of affairs, but the injustices meted out to his compatriots alike in Palestine and in the Dispersion penetrated his solitude, and gave point and actuality to his contemplation. Moreover, he grew confident that these trials were drawing to an end:

> 'For even though they be at the very extremities of the earth, acting as slaves to those enemies who have led them away in captivity, still they shall all be restored to freedom in one day, as at a given signal. . . . But when they have received this unexpected liberty . . . rising up with one impulse, and coming from all the different quarters imaginable, all hasten to one place pointed out to them, being guided on their way by some vision, more divine than is compatible with its being of the nature of man, invisible indeed to everyone else, but apparent only to those who were saved, having their separate inducements and intercessions, by whose intervention they might obtain a reconciliation with the Father.'[4]

[1] Acts i. 6.
[2] Acts v. 36, 37, xxi. 38.
[3] Mark xi. 12; cf. Luke xvi. 16, and John vi. 15.
[4] Philo, *De Exec.*, §§ viii. and ix.

But Philo is not content with indicating that deliverance is at hand, but goes on to set forth the manner of it :

> ' Some (of their opponents) will even flee when no one pursues at all except fear, turning their backs towards the evening . . . so that it will be very easy for the whole army to fall, being slain to a man : for a man will come forth, says the Word of God,[1] leading a host and warring furiously, who will subdue great and populous nations, God sending that assistance which is suitable for pious men, and this assistance is an intrepid hardihood of soul, and an irresistible strength of body, either of which things is formidable to the enemy, and if both qualities are united they are completely invincible.'[2]

In view of all the hopes of the time, one may well ask who this leader of the warring host was, and it is difficult to resist the conclusion that Philo meant by Him the Messiah.[3]

VI. The Syriac Apocalypse of Baruch

This is a composite work ' written by Pharisaic Jews as an apology for Judaism, and in part an implicit polemic against Christianity.' It belongs to the latter half of the first century of our era. ' In this Apocalypse,' says R. H. Charles, ' we have almost the last noble utterance of Judaism before it plunged into the dark and oppressive years that followed the destruction of Jerusalem.'[4]

Three sections which treat of the anticipated Messianic Kingdom were probably written before A.D. 70, and are therefore valuable as showing the hopes of the writer (or writers), and possibly of many others, at that time. These sections are (*a*) chap. xxvii–xxx. 1 ; (*b*) chap. xxxvi–xl ; and (*c*) chaps. liii.–lxxiv. In each we find not only a confident expectation of an approaching deliverance, but also a firm belief in the coming of a personal Messiah.

The first section (*a*) describes a terrible period of tribulation which will affect the whole earth, at the end of which Israel's enemies will all be destroyed. Then the Messiah will come and a time of extraordinary prosperity ensue. ' The earth also

[1] A reference to the Septuagint rendering of Num. xxiv. 7.
[2] *De Praemiis et poenis*, xvi.
[3] So Schürer, Emmet, and others.
[4] Charles, *Apoc. and Pseud.*, ii. p. 470.

shall yield its fruit ten-thousandfold, and on each vine shall be a thousand branches, and each branch shall produce a thousand clusters, and each cluster produce a thousand grapes, and each grape produce a cor of wine. And those who have hungered shall rejoice,' &c.[1] After this the Messiah will return to glory—an intimation of belief in His pre-existence. But nothing is said of the activity of the Messiah—His was to be a passive rôle, seemingly.

The second section (*b*) contains a vision and its interpretation. A huge forest is overwhelmed by a wonderful expanding fountain. One great cedar which escapes is ultimately burned. Then a vine, which was near the fountain, grows, and the whole plain is filled with ' unfading flowers.' In the interpretation which follows, it is signified that four great and tyrannous Empires will be overthrown when the Messiah's principate is revealed.[2] Finally, the last leader of the oppressors will be destroyed by the Messiah.[3]

The third (*c*) is longer and, like the section that precedes, consists of a vision and its interpretation. The long and chequered course of Israel's history, with its alternating prosperity and adversity, is set forth under the figure of white and black waters, the cloud and the lightning, concluding with the evils of the writer's own time. Then will appear the Messiah, ' when the nations become turbulent,' and ' He shall both summon all the nations and some of them He shall spare, and some of them He shall slay.'[4] In these last two sections, it will be noted, the Messiah becomes an active force, saving Israel and destroying her enemies.

VII. Josephus

Josephus, who fought against the Romans in the great war of independence, had evidently no doubt that it was the Messianic hope which inspired the desperate rebellion, though his interpretation of that hope does him little credit.

> ' But what stirred them (i.e. the Jews) up to the war was an ambiguous oracle that was found also in their sacred writings, that about that time one from their country should become ruler of the world. The Jews took this

[1] *Apoc. Bar.*, xxix. 5 *f.*
[2] Ibid., xl. 1–4.
[3] Ibid., xxxix. 7.
[4] Ibid., lxxii. 2.

prediction to belong to themselves, and many wise men were thereby deceived in their judgement. Now, this oracle certainly denoted the reign of Vespasian, who was declared Emperor in Judaea.'[1]

Such, then, in brief outline were the thoughts and hopes of the Jews at this critical time. That some of the writers looked for a peaceful solution of their difficulties is evident, but when such hopes and yearnings co-exist with political injustice and tyranny they can rarely be restrained. We must now turn to the sequel.

[1] *War*, VI. v. 4.

Chapter V

BEGINNINGS OF REVOLT

I. At The Death of Herod the Great

Passing by earlier evidences of discontent, we may take up the story with the last illness of the man who had held the people in his iron clutches for thirty-three years. As soon as news of his mortal affliction became known the spirit of rebellion broke loose. Two leading men, Judas and Matthias, described by Josephus as 'eloquent,' 'celebrated interpreters of Jewish laws,' and 'well beloved by the people,' incited the young men under their influence to pull down the large golden eagle which Herod had erected over the great gate of the Temple, and which was popularly regarded as idolatrous. Indignation was too hot to trouble about danger, and the deed was accomplished at midday. The troops arrested the two leaders and forty others who disdained to flee. When brought before the king and charged with pulling down what had been dedicated to God, they scorned Herod's alleged devotion to Jehovah and declared themselves ready for any punishment he might inflict. 'We will with pleasure undergo death, or whatever punishment thou mayest inflict upon us, since we are conscious to ourselves that we shall not die for any unrighteous actions, but for love to religion.'[1] Their boldness met the fate expected: all were burnt alive by orders of the dying king. Immediately after Herod's death, and Archelaus, his designated successor, began to assume the reins of power, the people demanded that appropriate vengeance should be taken on all who had connived with the deceased monarch at the deaths of Judas and Matthias. Archelaus, particularly anxious just then to displease no one, temporized, but the clamour increased, and no satisfaction being granted, a serious conflict took place between the people and the armed forces of the Government.

[1] *Ant.*, xvii. vi. 3.

As a result 3,000 of the people are said to have been slain; the remainder took refuge in the neighbouring hill-country.

II. Under Archelaus, 4 B.C.–A.D. 6

While Archelaus was absent in Rome, whither he had gone to obtain the confirmation of Herod's will, two revolts occurred. The first was successfully checked by Varus, Governor of Syria, but the second was more widespread, and proved too much for the strength of Sabinus, the local representative of Rome. In Galilee the leader of the rebels was Judas, the son of that Ezechias who had been captured and slain by Herod the Great in his earlier days. In Peraea, Simon, formerly a slave of Herod, took the lead. Elsewhere Athronges, a shepherd, led another band. In each case the leader aspired to kingly dignity. To deal with this general rising it was necessary for Varus to return from Antioch, and in the end he restored temporary quietude, 2,000 of the rebels being crucified.

Soon afterwards an embassy of fifty Jews was permitted by Varus to visit Rome 'to petition for the liberty of living according to their own laws.' They wanted no more of Herodian government, but desired to be governed directly by Roman representatives.[1] No doubt the nation hoped by this means to attain greater freedom from the petty exactions and irritating oppressions from which they had suffered in recent years. Augustus, however, refused their request, and Archelaus ruled as Ethnarch for about ten years. Readers of the New Testament will be interested in comparing certain references in Christ's Parable of the 'Pounds' with this part of our story: 'A certain nobleman went into a far country, to receive for himself a kingdom, and return. . . . But his citizens hated him, and sent an embassage after him saying: We will not that this man reign over us.'[2] Of the details of Archelaus's reign we know almost nothing, but are left in little doubt of its general character. After ten years Jews and Samaritans again protested against his misgovernment, and he was recalled from Judea and banished. Judea was then formally united to the province of Syria,[3] and procurators were appointed to represent the Roman overlord.

[1] *Ant.*, xvii. xi. 2; *War*, ii. vi. 2.
[2] Luke xix. 12, 14.
[3] A.D. 6.

III. The Census of Quirinius, A.D. 6–7

It is quite evident that the Jews in appealing for direct Roman government had not stopped to consider what this would imply. Had they done so the trouble which we have next to consider could hardly have arisen. The first procurator, sent in response to their desire, was Coponius, and at the same time Quirinius was appointed as the new Legate of Syria. At the outset it was his duty to make a census[1] of the people and territory of the new province. This was quite an ordinary proceeding in Roman provincial government, and could have suggested to Quirinius no apprehension.

The census was the basis of taxation, the poll-tax (*tributum capitis*) requiring an enumeration of the people by houses or families, and for the land-tax (*tributum agri*) a schedule of fields and other property was needed. Given Roman government it all seemed harmless enough and certainly inevitable, but the people had not anticipated such interference with their private affairs, and at once the fires of opposition broke out. Joazar, son of Boethus, who was high-priest at the time and an old friend of the Herodians, took the side of the authorities, and persuaded the bulk of the people to conform to the requirement. But some altogether refused his advice. Two men soon appeared as leaders of the opposition. One named Judas of Gamala, spoken of sometimes as a Gaulanite, but better known as a Galilean. He is usually identified with one of the leaders of the revolt suppressed by Varus, and consequently as the son of the robber Ezechias[2] who was put to death by Herod the Great. But in any case his place in history is assured as the actual founder of the hitherto disconnected party of the Zealots. The spirit of Zealotism seems to have run in his family, as James, Simon, and Menahem, his sons, and Eleazar, his grandson, all met their deaths, as he did himself,[3] fighting against the Romans. The second leader was Sadduc (or Zadok), a Pharisee. He was perhaps a member of the severer Shammaite section of that party.'[4] In the

[1] The census, or enrolment, referred to in Luke ii. 2, about which so much has been written, need not be discussed here. Those interested will find the matter adequately treated in Bible Dictionaries and Commentaries; also by Ramsay in *Was Christ Born in Bethlehem?* and *The Bearing of Recent Discovery on the Trustworthiness of the New Testament.* No doubt exists about the census mentioned in Acts v. 37.

[2] So Graetz and Schürer; many doubt this identification.

[3] Acts v. 37.

[4] So Graetz and Kohler.

association of two such men we may discern a combination of the strict legal Pharisaism, which could not tolerate interference with any of the sacred rights and privileges of a Jew by an outsider, with the old Maccabean spirit of combativeness or physical force in the interests of nation and religion.

The ground of the opposition was patriotic and religious. 'Both said that this taxation was nothing but a direct introduction of slavery, and exhorted the nation to assert their liberty. They also said that God would not assist them unless they joined with one another energetically for success, and still further set about great exploits and did not grow weary in executing the same.'[1] In brief, they declared the census to be an attempt on their liberty and on the sole rights of Jehovah to their tithes.

Though in the long run the Romans got their way, as they generally did, the whole nation was roused to an incredible degree, and it was only after much fighting, in which the Galilean leader perished, that they attained their end. Judas is characterized somewhat harshly by Hausrath as 'one of the historic holy simpletons who aim at what is impossible and run their heads against walls: effecting nothing outwardly, and yet exercising the greatest influence because they leave an irresistible example behind them'[2] His legacy to his fellow-countrymen was destined to become historic—the consolidation of the Zealots into a party which would grow in strength till Jerusalem lay in ruins around them.[3]

[1] *Ant.*, XVIII. i. 1; cf. XX. v. 2; *War*, II. viii. 1.

[2] *Times of Jesus*, ii. 79.

[3] Never again did the Romans attempt to take a census of the Jewish people (*War*, VI. ix. 3; cf. Haus., *T. J.*, ii. 80). They had evidently learnt their lesson.

Chapter VI

THE MOVEMENT DEVELOPS—PROVOCATION AND RESISTANCE

The early violence of the opposition to the census seems to have died down once the deed was done. There was probably nothing else possible, but the malcontents remained unappeased and waited and watched.

I. Early Procurators from A.D. 6 to A.D. 26

The following list of the first procurators furnished by Josephus, with their approximate dates, is almost the only information we possess of the next twenty years. They are Coponius (6–9); M. Ambivius (*circa* 9–12); Annius Rufus (*circa* 12–15); Valerius Gratus (*circa* 15–26).[1] But from two or three facts which are known it would seem that the silence is not entirely due to lack of incidents. Thus Tacitus says that 'The provinces . . . of Syria and Judea, exhausted by their burdens, implored a reduction of tribute.' This was in A.D. 17. He then adds, in the words of the Emperor Tiberius, that 'the commotions in the East . . . could only be quieted by the wisdom of Germanicus,' who was accordingly sent.[2] The people evidently continued to chafe under the newly imposed burden of taxation, and matters were not improved by the treatment at this time of Jews in Rome. Tiberius, according to Suetonius, 'distributed the Jewish youths, under the pretence of military service, among the provinces noted for an unhealthy climate, and dismissed from the city all the rest of that nation, as well as those who were proselytes to that religion, under pain of slavery for life, unless they complied.'[3]

[1] *Ant.*, xviii. ii. 2. [2] *Tac. An.*, ii. 42 f. [3] Suet. *Tiber.*, § xxxvi.

In the matter of religion, the Procurator Valerius Gratus went far to illustrate the inconsiderateness of the petty governor for the religious scruples of those over whom he was placed. The sacred office of high-priest was, according to Jewish custom, an appointment for life; but Gratus made no fewer than four changes during his eleven years of government, two of his nominees holding the post for one year only. Such events could only add to the existing discontent. It will be remembered, also, that under the Emperor Tiberius the procurators were retained in office much longer than previously, and though, as Josephus tells us, this was deliberately done in the interest of the governed, the reason assigned for it goes far to explain Jewish unrest. Each new governor, said the Emperor, set about making all he could out of his temporary subjects, and only when he had satisfied himself did he spare the people. To change the procurator frequently would therefore only add to the afflictions of the provinces.

> 'He gave an illustration to show his meaning. A great number of flies swarmed about the sore places of a man that had been wounded; upon which one of the bystanders pitied the man's misfortune, and thinking he was not able to drive those flies away himself was going to drive them away for him. But he prayed him to let them alone, and when the other asked him in rejoinder the reason of such indiscretion in not getting relief from his present misery, he replied, "If thou drivest these flies away, thou wilt hurt me worse. For as these are already full of my blood, they do not crowd about me, nor pain me so much as before, but are somewhat more remiss, while fresh ones that came almost famished, and found me quite tired out already, would be my destruction." Tiberius said this was why he was himself careful not to send new governors perpetually to his subjects.'[1]

II. Procuratorship of Pilate, A.D. 26–36

We now reach the fateful time of one well known to all New Testament readers because of his association with the condemnation of Jesus Christ. But apart from any prejudice against him on this account, his position in history is not an enviable one. Philo,[2] in a letter which Agrippa is alleged to

[1] *Ant.*, xviii. vi. 5.

[2] *Legatio ad Caium*, § 38.

have written to the Emperor Caius, gives a sorry description of one to whom so much power had been committed. Pilate is there described as ' a man of a very inflexible disposition and very merciless as well as very obstinate,' ' a man of most ferocious passions ' ; he also refers to his corruption, his acts of insolence, his rapine, his habit of insulting people, his cruelty, his continual murders of people untried and uncondemned, and his never-ending gratuitous and most grievous inhumanity. Such a characterization may contain exaggerations, but when full allowance has been made for these, it is a great reflection on the Roman government that it should have committed the interests of a restless province to the keeping of a man of such a character and temper. We must now record some of the troubles which arose during his term of office.

The first was due to the introduction into Jerusalem of the military standards bearing the Emperor's image. Earlier procurators had respected the Jewish objection to the presence of images in the Holy City, and considerately left the standards outside the city walls. Pilate, however, despised such weak concession, and one morning the people found to their amazement and horror that the procurator had sent the image-bearing standards into the city during the night. At once great numbers rushed down to Caesarea, and for five days and nights implored him to remove them. But he was obdurate, asserting that to comply would be to offer insult to the Emperor. When they persisted he grew angry, and finally surrounded the malcontents with an ambush of soldiers. He then threatened them all with death unless they dispersed and went home again. The effect must have greatly astonished him, for the people threw themselves on the ground and bared their necks for the soldiers' swords, saying that they preferred death rather than that their laws should be transgressed. Pilate yielded, the standards were removed, and the danger passed for the moment.

Not long afterwards he again trampled on the cherished customs and privileges of the people in carrying out what was otherwise a very useful piece of work. This was when he ' introduced water into Jerusalem, paying for the work with the sacred money ' of the Temple, thus contravening one of their most sacred principles. When next he came to the city he found himself surrounded by a clamouring crowd who

'insisted that he should abandon his intention.' Instead of this, however, he secretly mixed with the crowd his own soldiers disguised in Jewish dress, and at a prearranged moment gave them the signal to beat the people with their staves. In this way he put a speedy end to the insurrection, but at the same time increased the growing hatred of his subjects for himself.

The next incident is concerned with the introduction of votive tablets or *gilt shields* into the old Herodian Palace at Jerusalem. As a matter of fact the idea that these shields bore an image was a mistake, as they carried only an inscription indicating the donor and the one in whose honour it was dedicated. But the Jews suspected that Pilate's innovation was at least preparatory to the introduction of Caesar-worship, and in this were in all likelihood not wrong. Four sons of Herod headed a deputation to the Governor pleading that the honour of the Emperor did not require dishonour to their ancient laws. But it was in vain. Then a letter was dispatched to Tiberius, with the result that Pilate was ordered to comply with the people's request.[1]

Before passing on it may be well to point out, especially in view of later events, that since the days of Judas, in spite of great provocation, the Jews had acted entirely within the limits of constitutional protest and had been met with scarcely veiled contempt on the part of the procurator. If the spirit of violence still existed in some quarters, as it probably did, it was evidently overborne by saner and more moderate counsels. Had this moderate temper only been matched by a wiser spirit in the local Roman ruler, it can hardly be doubted that the later disasters would have been avoided.

Another episode, in which the scene is transferred from Jerusalem to Samaria, was of a more sinister nature than the foregoing, and led to Pilate's recall. A certain enthusiast promised to show his fellow-Samaritans the sacred vessels which had been hidden in Mount Gerizim since the death of Moses, if they would repair thither with him. It was popularly believed that the rediscovery of these vessels would herald

[1] It should be added that some writers, e.g. Mangey and Seinecke, treat this incident as only another form of that connected with the standards. Hausrath, Leyrer, and Schürer argue for their independence. Two distinguishing features seem in favour of the latter view, viz. that in the one case there were actually images and in the other these were absent; again, in the former case Pilate yielded without Imperial intervention, whereas in the latter case this was necessary. It seems probable, therefore, that they are two distinct events.

the approach of the Messianic era. Great numbers set out and went armed. But they never reached the mountain, for Pilate's forces intercepted their progress. Some were slain, and many of the leaders and their followers executed. The Samaritan Senate at once addressed themselves to Vitellius, the Legate of Syria, charging the procurator with the murder of their fellow-countrymen, and Pilate was sent to Rome to answer for his conduct, whence he never returned.

Before leaving this Governor mention may be made of the references to him in the New Testament, though unfortunately in one case our information is very slight. Luke reports a conversation in which the people remind Jesus 'of the Galileans whose blood Pilate had mingled with their sacrifices.'[1] Nothing further is known of this either in sacred or profane literature, but judging from our certain knowledge of Pilate there is no reason to question its historicity. The crime would be one of peculiar horror from a Jewish point of view, as in addition to slaying men engaged in the act of offering the sacred sacrifice, there was the unusual enormity of mingling human blood with that of offerings dedicated to the Most High.

Jesus v. *Barabbas*

The other reference in the New Testament is also of great value, as it reveals the elements which surged round Jesus at the time of His condemnation. The Jews certainly showed considerable astuteness when in the presence of Pilate they charged Jesus with 'perverting our nation and forbidding to give tribute to Caesar, and saying that He Himself is Christ a king (or an anointed king).'[2] It was a political accusation, quite in the spirit of the time, which the ruler dared not ignore, and which, had he believed it true, he would be little disposed to pardon. Plainly interpreted it was a charge against Jesus of being a Zealot leader; but when Barabbas was chosen to be liberated in place of Jesus, Pilate could hardly have been deceived. Both were typical: the one representative of the Messianic hope, to be realized by spiritual forces, the other 'who for a certain insurrection made in the city, and for murder, was cast into prison,'[3] stood for that party of violence which had already greatly disturbed the procurator's tranquillity. Had Pilate been free to make his choice between the two there

[1] Luke xiii. 1. [2] Luke xxiii. 2. [3] Luke xxiii. 19.

can be little doubt that Jesus would have escaped, but for once his subjects were too strong for him. The incident affords an opportunity of marking the strength of a movement which, though well in hand, just then contained dangerous possibilities.

III. Caligula's Reign, A.D. 37–41

We pass over the next two procurators,[1] of whom little is known. The reign of the Emperor Caius Caligula is marked by two entirely different features: the kindly and considerate treatment of Vitellius, the Legate of Syria, and the mad tyrannical aggressiveness of the Emperor himself; the one tending to ameliorate the strained relationships between the rulers and the ruled, the other going far to convince even the law-abiding of the hopelessness of a peaceable issue of their contention with Rome.

First in order comes the kindly conduct of Vitellius. On visiting Judea after the dismissal of Pilate he at once remitted the taxation on articles sold in the market. He then made a most graceful concession to Jewish susceptibilities by placing the festal garments worn by the high-priests in the hands of the Temple authorities. Ever since the advent of Herod to the throne these vestments had been retained as a kind of hostage by the civil power, save when required for the three annual festivals and the Day of Atonement. Now, however, Vitellius delivered them to the ecclesiastics, and ordered that no further inquiry should be made 'where they were laid or when they were to be used.'[2] In the same spirit of conciliation, and in response to the people's earnest request, he changed the route of his army, then on the march against the Nabateans, so that they should not pass through Judea, thus saving the Jews the outrage of beholding the image-bearing standards passing through their land. He further gratified the more scrupulous by dismissing Caiaphas from the high-priesthood, and together 'with Herod the tetrarch and his friends went up to Jerusalem to offer sacrifice to God, as an ancient festival of the Jews was then at hand.'[3]

All this showed the true spirit of government, and would have done much to foster the spirit of contentedness among the people, but all was more than lost by the action of Caligula.

[1] Marcellus (A.D. 36–37) and Marullus (A.D. 37–41).
[2] *Ant.*, XVIII. iv. 3. [3] *Ant.*, XVIII. v. 3.

No greater misfortune could have happened than the advent of this monarch to the supreme place in the Empire. Of his character there can be no doubt. Not only do Jewish writers paint it in the blackest colours, but Romans do the same. Ill-natured, essentially wicked, 'a slave to pleasure and a lover of calumny; greatly afraid of what was formidable, and of a very murderous disposition where he dare show it. He enjoyed his power to this only purpose, to injure those that least deserved it with unreasonable arrogance, and he got his wealth by murder and injustice . . . whatever the laws determined to be shameful and censured that he esteemed more honourable than virtue.'[1] 'He lived in the habit of incest with his sisters'; robbed his friends of their wives; never hesitated to slay his best friends when the whim took him; and on one occasion, when the crowds in the circus displeased him, exclaimed, 'I wish the Roman people had but one neck.'[2] The most charitable supposition is that he was mad. Such was the man who now became Emperor, and it soon went hard with the Jews.

For a period of about eighteen months all went well. But his hatred of the Jews showed itself in his toleration of the so-called *Jew-hunt at Alexandria*, though Mommsen argues that his hatred was the consequence and not the cause of this disgraceful barbarity.[3] Statues of the Emperor were placed in the Jewish Synagogues, their Sabbaths abolished, their leaders scourged, and the houses in the Jewish quarter ruined. And when a deputation of Jews, headed by Philo, went to Rome to plead for the Emperor's intervention, a counter deputation led by Apion had little difficulty in gaining his ear and approval. It can hardly be supposed that the news of such occurrences would tend to allay the apprehensions of the Jews in Palestine. But a much severer test was fast approaching. 'In process of time,' so Josephus informs us, Caligula 'thought himself, because of the vast extent of his dominions, as something more than a man, and made himself a god, and took upon himself to act in all things so as to insult the Deity.'[4] Deification had already been tolerated by Caligula's two predecessors, Augustus and Tiberius, but both Emperors had taken care to avoid hurting Jewish sensitiveness. This moderation was now thrown to the winds. In A.D. 39 Petronius, the

[1] *Ant.*, XIX. ii. 5.
[2] Suetonius, *Caligula*, 24, 30, &c.
[3] *Prov. R. E.*, ii., p. 192, *n.*
[4] *Ant.*, XVIII. vii. 2.

new Legate of Syria, received a command to proceed to Judea with an armed force and set up the *imperial statue in the Temple* at Jerusalem. Apparently the opposition of the Alexandrian Jews had only whetted Caligula's appetite for more excitement of a similar order. Petronius, distasteful as was the mission and knowing well its dangers, had no option in the matter, and moved southward to execute it. He was met first at Ptolemais, and then at Tiberias, by thousands of the people, who pleaded with him not to carry out an order which meant for them the desecration of their holy Temple and the degradation of the nation. So distressed were they that the fields, then waiting for the seed, were neglected, though this would bring famine later in the year. When the legate urged them to accept the inevitable, they assured him that, though unable to challenge the might of Rome with physical force, they were quite willing to die rather than tolerate the proposed outrage against their laws. High-placed leaders joined in the remonstrance, and Petronius was in despair. He felt himself confronted with a hard alternative. To carry out the Emperor's command meant the slaughter of thousands of helpless people ; to refrain would endanger not only his own position, but even his life. To his honour Petronius chose the latter alternative, and forwarded a letter to Rome in which he endeavoured to dissuade Caligula from his purpose. But it was not Petronius's letter which diverted the madman from pursuing his evil fancy further. Agrippa the Jew, an intimate friend of the Emperor, was then in Rome and managed by some means to persuade him to revoke the order. When, later, Petronius's letter arrived Caligula's rage knew no bounds, and he forthwith condemned the legate to death, a fate which was only averted by his own assassination.

But though the danger was over, the episode left an indelible impression on the minds of the people. Again, it should be noted, the people had refrained from any act of violence ; and so far this must have proved satisfactory to those who believed in constitutional resistance to injustice. But the wantonness of the affront to their religion must have gone far to convince even the most pacific that there was but one way out of the existing impasse, and that a way of violence.[1]

[1] Cf. *Ant.*, XVIII. vii. 2, viii., XIX. i., ii. 5 ; *War*, II. x. ; Philo, *De. leg. ad Caium* ; Suetonius, *Caligula*.

Chapter VII

AGRIPPA (A.D. 41–44)—A LULL IN THE STORM

After the dangerous period just described there came an interval, all too short, of bright hope and promise. Agrippa,[1] the grandson of Herod the Great, had assisted Claudius to the vacancy created by the death of Caius Caligula, and the new Emperor was not slow to recompense his benefactor. First of all he confirmed Agrippa in the positions to which he had been appointed by Caligula, viz. the tetrarchies formerly held by Philip, Lysanias, and Antipas. To these he next added the provinces of Judea and Samaria, thus making him the first real successor to his grandfather, Herod the Great. Claudius also adopted an entirely new policy towards the Jewish religion and issued edicts, preserved by Josephus, insisting on its being treated with respect. 'I decree,' he proclaimed, 'that the nation of the Jews be not deprived of their rights and privileges on account of the madness of Caius, but that those rights and privileges which they formerly enjoyed be preserved to them, and that they may continue in their customs. And I charge both parties to take care that no trouble arises after the promulgation of this edict.' 'It is therefore right to permit the Jews throughout all our Empire to keep their ancient customs without let or hindrance.'[2]

Thus it came about that a time of peace and tranquillity once more visited the distracted land. Religion was respected, and a Jew (or half-Jew) held the reins of government. Agrippa himself observed with the utmost scrupulousness all the requirements of Pharisaic legalism. He did, indeed, persecute the Christians, killing James, the son of Zebedee, and imprisoning Peter,[3] but this only pleased the Jews the more, and this was his sole object. He even favoured Jewish aspirations to independence by commencing to build a wall on the north of

[1] Mentioned in Acts. xii. [2] *Ant.*, xix. v. 2, 3. [3] Acts xii.

Jerusalem and, later, convoked an assembly of ruling princes at Tiberias. But the intense gratification which Agrippa's rule afforded the people only goes to show the straits to which the Roman government had reduced them, for the new king was anything but an ideal Jew. For if a Jew among Jews, he was equally a Roman among Romans. But after their recent experiences it was not difficult to turn a blind eye towards offences of this sort, or to feel gratitude to one who in practice, at any rate, acted as a defender of their faith. But the three years soon passed, and still worse troubles were to follow.

Chapter VIII

SPORADIC REBELLIONS

Agrippa's only son was a youth of only seventeen years, and though it was in the mind of Claudius to appoint him in the place of his father, he allowed himself to be dissuaded by his advisers. It was a tragic decision, though of course defensible enough. Had the rulership of the now satisfied country only been retained in Jewish hands, it is more than probable that the war which broke out in the next reign would have been avoided. As it turned out, the succession of procurators grew steadily worse, and rebellions soon occurred. 'The proper result was the constant increase of the new Maccabees. It has been customary to put the outbreak of war in the year 66; with equal and perhaps better warrant we might name for it the year 44. Since the death of Agrippa warfare in Judea had never ceased, and alongside of the local feuds, which Jews fought out with Jews, there went on constantly the war of the Roman troops against the seceders in the mountains, the Zealots, as the Jews named them, or according to Roman designation, the Robbers.'[1]

I. Cuspius Fadus (A.D. 44–*c.* 47)

The first two of the new batch of procurators were probably the best. According to Josephus, they, 'making no alterations in the ancient laws, kept the nation in tranquillity.'[2] Without, perhaps, intending to do more than safeguard the interests of the supreme power, Fadus began by revoking the concession of Vitellius with respect of the custody of the sacred vestments of the high-priest, and placed them again in the hands of the civil authority. It was a most discouraging and

[1] Mom., *Prov. R. E.*, ii., p. 203 f.

[2] *War*, II. xi. 6.

irritating beginning. Still, he permitted an embassy of Jews to go to Rome and lay the matter before the Emperor, and they, with the help of the young Agrippa, received the renewal of the concession. Even more, for 'authority over the Temple and the sacred money and the choice of the high-priests'[1] was taken once for all out of the hands of the procurator and given to Herod of Chalcis, the brother of the deceased Agrippa, and at his death to the younger Agrippa.

But the spirit of unrest, now thoroughly aroused, could not be allayed by such considerateness, and rebellion again broke out. It was headed by one Theudas, a man described by Josephus as an 'impostor' and by Gamaliel as one 'giving himself out to be somebody.'[2] He gathered around him a multitude of followers and persuaded them to accompany him to the Jordan, where he promised to divide the river and so afford them 'an easy passage over it.' Fadus, however, scenting mischief, intercepted them with cavalry, who cut them up and brought the leader's head in triumph to Jerusalem.

There are certain chronological difficulties[3] in the two accounts given by Josephus and the author of the Acts. But apart from these the incident is of great significance. It is the beginning of the rebellion, and the absence of any known provocation only emphasizes this. Was it the result of the disappointment felt at the reappearance of the procurators, or the act of Fadus in again demanding the custody of the high-priests' vestments? We can only surmise; but it is

[1] *Ant.*, xx. ii. 3. [2] Acts v. 36.

[3] Both Josephus and the writer of Acts mention an insurrection led by one named Theudas. The former (*Ant.*, xx. v. 1 f.) refers the incident to the time of Fadus, *circa* A.D. 44–46. Luke (Acts v. 36), however, quoting from Gamaliel's speech, makes it prior to Judas of Galilee (i.e. *circa* A.D. 6). Moreover, Gamaliel's speech was delivered *circa* A.D. 37, i.e. according to Josephus, several years before the date of Theudas. The difficulty has long been recognized and treated in different ways:

(1) Do the two records deal with two different incidents? Origen (*Con. Celsum*, i. 57) thought so. Some modern writers, e.g. Lightfoot, Edersheim, and Ramsay, point to the large number of revolutionaries mentioned by Josephus at the earlier period, and suggest that the Theudas of Acts may have been one of these, under another name.

(2) Others, e.g. Michaelis and Blass, think that the name Theudas may have crept into the account of Josephus, inserted by some Christian writer from the record in Acts.

(3) The majority of modern writers, like Holtzmann, Clemen, and Schmiedel, suspect the accuracy of Luke's narrative. Their argument is that he was dependent for his story on Josephus, but had read him carelessly, perhaps confusing the story of Theudas with that of the sons of Judas, which is given in the following paragraph. Here much depends upon the general question of Luke's relationship to Josephus, and on this point no agreement has yet been reached.

The data at our disposal do not permit any satisfactory solution of the problem, but at any rate there is little or no doubt about the insurrection in the time of Fadus.

clear that the Zealots had at last thrown away the hope, however little it was, of gaining their ends by constitutional means, and were now determined to try violence.

II. Tiberius Alexander (*circa* A.D. 47–48)

It may have been with the object of counteracting this that Claudius now appointed a Jew as Governor. Alexander was the son of a distinguished Jew of Alexandria and the nephew of Philo, but unhappily for his success in his new position he had abandoned his faith. Of him Josephus briefly records that he slew James and Simon, sons of Judas of Gamala, the famous usurper in the days of the assessment of Cyrenius. No reason is assigned, but it is not difficult to believe that the sons were engaged in emulating the father.[1] The blood of Theudas had evidently fertilized the ground.

III. Ventidius Cumanus (A.D. 48–52)

Cumanus came to Judea at a time which was calculated to try the administrative abilities of the ablest and most equitable of procurators, but events soon proved his inadequacy for the task. A strong and just Governor might possibly have succeeded in allaying the increasing sensitiveness of the people and undermining the persistent agitation of the Zealots, but Cumanus was neither strong nor just. Indeed, in one instance, and that the one which led to a mighty upheaval and his own banishment, he is accused by Josephus of accepting bribes from men whom he should have punished. The action of the Emperor, on the other hand, shows him determined to minimize as much as possible the maleficent handiwork of his representative in Judea.

The first event from which trouble arose displayed the weakness of the Governor. A Roman soldier on guard at the Temple exposed himself indecently in the presence of the worshippers and added insulting words. Had the Governor only dealt with the offender summarily the tumult immediately aroused might have been allayed without difficulty. But, instead, he sent his soldiers to quell the disturbance. The appearance of the soldiers provoked a panic, and numbers of the people (Josephus wavers between 10,000 and 20,000) perished in the scuffle.

[1] So Schürer.

Soon afterwards some of the rioters, incensed doubtless by the preceding incident and thirsting for revenge, waylaid and robbed a certain Stephanus, a servant of Caesar, on the public road within 100 furlongs of Jerusalem. Thereupon the procurator sent a military punitive expedition to plunder the neighbouring villages. Intoxicated with his work, one of the soldiers, coming upon a roll of the Jewish Law, publicly tore it in pieces. This naturally maddened the people beyond measure, and they rushed down to Caesarea to demand vengeance on the culprit. This time Cumanus was evidently alarmed, and to save further trouble had the offending soldier beheaded.

It was, however, the next and final incident of his procuratorship which destroyed whatever reputation Cumanus may have had for competency and character. As is well known, there was an old-standing feud between the Jews and the Samaritans, and when Galileans used to pass through Samaria to attend the feasts at Jerusalem this bitterness not infrequently showed itself in untoward acts. Towards the end of Cumanus's time the Samaritans, provoked doubtless by words or deeds which Josephus does not see fit to record, fell upon the pilgrims from the north and slew many of them. The Jews appealed to Cumanus for redress, but being bribed, as Josephus tells us, by the Samaritans not to interfere, he paid no heed, and the Galileans then took the matter into their own hands. How deep was the resentment felt by the Galileans is expressed by Josephus: 'The Galileans . . . urged the multitude of the Jews to betake themselves to arms and to regain their liberty, and said that slavery was in itself a bitter thing, but when it was joined with injuries it was perfectly intolerable.'[1] Their quarrel was only incidentally with the Samaritans; fundamentally it was a revolt against the whole system under which they groaned. The matter was carried to great lengths. They sought and obtained the co-operation of Eleazar, a man described by Josephus as 'the arch-robber, who had ravaged the country for twenty years,'[2] evidently a Zealot who had been obliged to betake himself to the hills for safety. Another of the same type, named Alexander, also joined the movement, and together they plundered and set on fire several Samaritan villages. Cumanus was now obliged to take steps to restore

[1] *Ant.*, xx. vi. 1. [2] *War*, II. xiii. 2.

order, and did so with vigour and severity. Many of the revolters were slain in the fight, and others were captured. Eminent persons at Jerusalem, fearing the worst, then intervened, and pleaded with the insurrectionaries to desist from further resistance lest they should bring complete ruin on their land. 'These arguments prevailed with them. So the people dispersed and the robbers went away again to their strongholds. And from this time all Judea was overrun with bands of robbers.'[1] Appeal was next made to Ummidius Quadratus, the Legate of Syria, who instituted an inquiry. This led to the crucifixion of some of the leading culprits and, further, revealed a widespread conspiracy on the part of some highly-placed Jews, including the high-priest himself. Quadratus was also dissatisfied with the conduct of the procurator and sent him at once to Rome along with the prominent Jews implicated, to answer for their deeds to the Emperor. To the honour of Claudius it is to be recorded that he immediately banished Cumanus and sent Celer, a Roman tribune who had acted with him, back to Jerusalem to be executed.

IV. Felix (A.D. 52–60)

If the procuratorship of Cumanus was a misfortune, that of his successor was a disaster. Felix, by general admission, was one of the worst of the many unworthy men who held that office. He was a freed man, and owed his appointment to his being the brother of Pallas, a favourite of the Emperor. Of his character one of his own countrymen may be called as witness. Tacitus says: 'Antonius Felix exercised the prerogatives of a king with the spirit of a slave,'[2] than which one cannot imagine a more contemptuous indictment of a Roman by a Roman. Elsewhere he speaks of him as one who 'thought that he could do any evil act with impunity, backed up as he was by such power.'[3] Of his private morals it need only be said that they would have been an affront to a much less religious nation than the Jews.

It must be frankly admitted that the condition of the country was enough to appal any man called upon to govern it. Josephus describes it as 'full of bands of robbers and of impostors who deluded the multitude,' and that 'Felix captured and put to death many of these impostors every day, as well

[1] *Ant.*, xx. vi. 1. [2] *Hist.*, v. 9. [3] *Annales*, xii. 54.

as the robbers.'[1] We shall probably not err greatly if for Josephus's word 'robbers' we read the word 'Zealots,' for this was the form zealotism had now taken, and a writer like Josephus, who deplored the movement, would not be likely to describe its activities too euphemistically. He adds:

> 'And they divided themselves into different bodies up and down the country, and plundered the houses of the well-to-do people, and slew the men themselves and set villages on fire; so that all Judea was filled with the effects of their madness. And thus this war was every day more and more fanned into flame.'[2]

Readers of the Acts of the Apostles will also recall that, in connexion with the arrest and trials of St. Paul in the time of Felix, a band of men bound themselves by oath to waylay and slay the apostle, and that a further attempt was made by the same or a similar band in the time of his successor, Festus.[3] Whether these men were Zealots or not[4] it serves to show the lawless condition into which the nation had fallen.

It was at this time, too, that the activities of the men of the dagger, known as Sicarii, emerge into prominence: 'Who slew men in the daytime and in the midst of the city, especially at the festivals, when they mixed with the multitude, and concealed little daggers under their garments, with which they stabbed those that were their enemies; and when any fell down dead, the murderers joined the bystanders in expressing their indignation, so that from their plausibility they could by no means be discovered.'[5] Not content with slaying enemies they also attacked innocent citizens for plunder. And those who refused to join or show sympathy with them were always in danger of having their houses fired or plundered.

At the outset Felix showed some determination to cope with this desperate condition of affairs, and his action was marked by energy and cruelty. But his subsequent leniency more than suggests that he let the desperadoes alone at the price of sharing their booty. In one prominent instance he even invited their assistance to get rid of the high-priest Jonathan, who had annoyed him with remonstrances in regard to his government.

Of Messianic 'impostors' there were probably many, and

[1] *Ant.*, xx. viii. 5. [2] *War*, II. xiii. 6. [3] Acts xxiii. 12; xxv. 3.
[4] Meyer denies the suggestion. *Com.*, ad loc. [5] *War*, II. xiii. 3.

of one we have a somewhat fuller account. He was an Egyptian,[1] for whom Paul was mistaken later on, who secured a large following among the people.[2] Under the influence of their own hopes and his promises, a great crowd accompanied him to the Mount of Olives to witness the walls of Jerusalem fall flat at his word. His ultimate purpose is not in doubt, being nothing less than the destruction of the Roman garrison, and no doubt after that the exclusion of the Roman power from the land. But by slaying 400 of his dupes and taking 200 captive Felix brought his schemes to an end, though the leader himself escaped. One sees in the story the great influence of the eschatological ideas then current in the minds of the common folk, which made them peculiarly susceptible to any one who claimed power to realize them.

To add to the general chaos riots now broke out between Jews and Syrians at Caesarea. For long the Jews had enjoyed special rights and privileges over their neighbours because Herod the Great had founded the city, but these were now contested. Very soon Felix felt obliged to intervene, and did so as usual with the soldiery, slaying, capturing, and plundering the richer Jews. In the end the Jews not only lost all the privileges formerly accorded to them, but were reduced below the level of their neighbours.

As if to make confusion worse confounded, disorders next spread among the high-priests and eminent men at Jerusalem.

> 'And such shamelessness and boldness seized on the high-priests that they ventured to send their slaves to the threshing-floors to take the tithes that were due to the priests, so that the poorest sort of priests died for want. To this degree did the violence of faction prevail over right and justice.'[3]

The history of this time as reflected by Luke in the Acts of the Apostles goes to confirm the account already given. Tertullus, the accuser of St. Paul, refers to him as 'a pestilent fellow and a mover of insurrections among all the Jews throughout the world, and a ringleader of the sect of the Nazarenes, who moreover essayed to profane the Temple.'[4] We need not stop to disprove the accusation; rather would we point to it as

[1] *Ant.*, xx. viii. 6; Acts xxi. 38.
[2] Acts says 4,000; Josephus 30,000.
[3] *Ant.*, xx. viii. 8.
[4] Acts xxiv. 5 f.

indicating the preoccupations of governor and governed at the time. Of Felix the sinister record is that he had several interviews with his prisoner, not merely or mainly because of his interest in his teaching, but because he hoped for a bribe to induce him to set him free.[1]

V. Porcius Festus (A.D. 60–62)

Little is known of this procurator who succeeded Felix. Before he had completed two years of service in Judea he was removed by death. Yet he appears to have been much more suited for the post than his predecessor, and had he lived longer some amelioration might have been effected in the relations between the Jews and the superior power.

The land had been left in a terrible plight by Felix : robbers roamed over the country setting on fire and plundering villages at will ; the Sicarii continued their murderous activities ; and another impostor, promising deliverance and freedom to all who would follow him, essayed to lead them into the wilderness. Against such disturbers of the peace Festus sent armed forces, but though many were slain and the remainder scattered for the time, nothing permanent was achieved.

An indiscretion on the part of Agrippa II led to further trouble, which a wiser and more considerate man would have avoided. His palace at Jerusalem was not far from the Temple, and he now had a large dining-room added to it which enabled him not only to obtain an extensive view over the city as a whole, but also to ' see what was being done in the Temple.' Naturally angry at this invasion of their sacred privacy the Jews countered it by building a wall high enough to stop the view. Agrippa appealed to Festus, who sided with him and ordered the Jews to pull the wall down again. This they refused to do, and asked that an embassy might be sent to Rome to lay the matter before the Emperor. Festus was generous enough to accede to this request, and Nero, influenced by his wife, Poppea, ' who was a religious woman, and had requested these favours of Nero,'[2] supported the Jews and the wall was allowed to remain.

Little additional light is thrown on Festus or his government by the New Testament record. His attitude towards Paul and his accusers seems to have been ' correct,' though the

[1] Acts xxiv. 26.

[2] *Ant.*, xx. viii. 11.

apostle's confidence in his impartiality does not seem to have been very great, since he deemed it prudent to appeal from his judgement-seat to that of Caesar. Still, this may have been due not so much to a lack of confidence in Festus himself, as to a fear that his own enemies would compel the procurator to side with them.

Towards the end of this period, or, according to Josephus, in the interval between the death of Festus and the arrival of his successor, James the Just, brother of Jesus, was put to death. Some uncertainty exists in our records as to the actual culprits. Josephus lays the blame on Ananus, or Annas, the high-priest; whereas Eusebius, relying on Clement and Hegesippus, attributes the act to the Jews, probably the Zealots.[1]

Lagrange, referring to the fanatical movements of this time, calls attention to the ease with which they were repressed whenever the Messianic element was wanting. He cites, for instance, the case of the Egyptian in the time of Felix, against whom even the Jews themselves lent the Governor their aid.[2] But one may ask whether such a movement as this and others like it were not all Messianic after a type. Also, whether it is not the case that to the very end some of the leading Jews at Jerusalem were opposed to violent measures for any purpose whatsoever. Nevertheless, Lagrange is surely right in his general thesis, viz. that it was the Messianic element which gave life to the movement against the Romans, but his application of it to the cases of failure is at least doubtful.

VI. Albinus (A.D. 62–64)

If one experiences a feeling of regret at the early removal by death of Festus, there is no place for such an emotion in the case of Albinus, his successor, though his rule lasted no longer than that of the other. The details of his deeds are somewhat scanty, but, even so, none ranks lower than he in the scale of procurators save the one who precipitated the war two years afterwards. Josephus brings a terrible indictment against him:

> 'There was no kind of wickedness but he had a hand in it. For not only did he in his official position steal and plunder

[1] *Euseb. Hist.*, ii. 23.

[2] *Le Messianisme*, p. 22.

every one's substance, and burden the whole nation with taxes, but he permitted the relations of such as were in prison for robbery, and had been put there either by the Senate of every city or by former governors, to redeem them for money, and nobody remained in the prisons as a malefactor, but he who gave him nothing.'[1]

On hearing of the appointment of his successor he at once set about making the best of the short time remaining to him. All prisoners worthy of death, i.e. whose guilt was too serious for them to be bought out, he executed. The rest he set free on receipt of adequate bribes from their friends.

The lawlessness of the time, even in the best circles, may be seen in the way in which the servants of the high-priest Ananias enriched their master at the expense of the poorer priests. It is very similar to what occurred in the time of Felix. The tithes upon which these poor priests depended for their livelihood were snatched from them by *force majeure* by the servants of the one who ought to have been their protector. It is therefore no surprise to learn that these 'protectors' next proceeded to fight each other.

'They got together bodies of the boldest sort of people, who frequently from reproaches proceeded to throwing stones at each other. But Ananias got the best of it, as by his riches he gained over those that were most ready to receive.'[2]

The Sicarii were not slow to take advantage of the general turmoil. Among their many exploits at this time, one is recorded the like of which was probably repeated from time to time. Seizing the secretary of Eleazar, the governor of the Temple, they held him as a hostage for the return of ten of their own party who for some reason had been taken prisoners. And so powerful had these cut-throats become that nothing was left but for Eleazar to obtain the consent of Albinus to the exchange. Speaking of the terror with which they were regarded, Josephus says:

'So it happened that those who were robbed of their goods were forced to hold their peace, though they had

[1] *War*, II. xiv. 1.

[2] *Ant.*, XX. ix. 4.

cause for great indignation, and those who had escaped were forced to flatter him that deserved punishment, from fear of suffering the same things. And to sum up, nobody durst speak their minds, for tyranny was generally prevalent; and at this time the seeds were sown which brought the city to destruction.'[1]

VII. Gessius Florus (A.D. 64–66)

When Albinus was recalled the Jews fondly believed that they had seen quite the worst possible of governors, but the appointment of Florus soon gave them good ground for revising their opinion. Gessius Florus owed his appointment to the friendship of his wife Cleopatra, 'who was,' Josephus says, 'as wicked as he was,' with the Empress Poppea. In comparing him with Albinus, for whom he had already found it difficult to find sufficiently condemnatory terms, Josephus says that Florus

'showed him to have been a most just person by comparison. For the former did most of his ill-deeds in private and with a sort of dissimulation, but Gessius made a show of his lawlessness to the nation, and as though he had been sent as an executioner to punish condemned malefactors, omitted no sort of outrage. For in cases that required pity he was most barbarous, and in disgraceful things he was most shameless; nor could any one outdo him in disguising the truth, nor contrive more subtle ways of deceit. He indeed thought it a poor thing to get money out of individuals, so he spoiled whole cities, and ruined entire bodies of men at once, and did all but publicly proclaim all over the country that everybody had liberty to turn robber, upon condition that he went shares in the spoil. And owing to his cupidity entire toparchies were brought to desolation; and many people left their country, and fled into strange provinces.'[2]

At an early stage, when Cestius Gallus, the Legate of Syria, came to the great feast at Jerusalem, the whole mass of the people, numbering (Josephus says) about three millions, made unanimous complaint against Florus, but he managed to appease the Legate and nothing was done, though promises

[1] *War*, II. xiv. 1.

[2] *War*, II. xiv. 2.

were made. In reality the complaint only made Florus the more determined to hasten on the war.

> 'For he expected that, if peace continued, he should have the Jews for his accusers before the Emperor, but if he could make them revolt, he should divert the Emperor's attention from smaller matters by this greater evil. So he every day augmented their calamities in order to induce them to revolt from the Romans.'[1]

Presently a favourable opportunity presented itself to further this diabolical scheme. A quarrel broke out again at Caesarea between the Jews and the Greeks—a relic of the former trouble under Felix. There can be no doubt that the Jews were being grossly insulted by their fellow-citizens, and one of the Jews, entering into the spirit of the time, offered Florus a bribe to induce him to grant them justice. But the procurator, while accepting the bribe, left the disputants to fight it out. In the end the Jews gathered up their Law-books and forsook the city.[2]

The final act of injustice which brought all peaceable government to an end was connected with the seizure of the Temple treasure. In May A.D. 66 Florus took seventeen talents from this source on pretence that the Emperor needed the money. The Jews reproached and remonstrated with him, but in vain. Knowing full well that the money would never get farther than the governor's own exchequer, some of the outraged people, in bitter humour, 'carried a basket about and begged some small coins for him as for a miserable beggar.'[3] Soon after he made his appearance in Jerusalem, and the people received him obsequiously, but far from being mollified he turned his soldiers upon them to slay and plunder. Then Berenice, sister of Agrippa II, ventured to plead with the murderous governor for a cessation of such slaughters, but it availed nothing. Instead, he arranged for the people to go out of the city to meet his soldiers, and they, warned in advance, not only ignored their greetings, but when the people complained of their rudeness fell on them with such ferocity as to produce a panic. Many were beaten, crushed to death, and then so trampled on 'that none of them could be recognized by his

[1] *War*, II. xiv. 3. [2] *War*, II. xiv. 4 f. [3] *War*, II. xiv. 6.

relations for burial.'[1] At last, to the relief of everybody, the procurator returned to his palace at Caesarea.

Florus's next step was to write to the Legate Cestius accusing the Jews of revolting against the Romans. This, however, was countered by another letter to the same authority from the rulers of Jerusalem and Berenice, charging Florus with acts of lawlessness against the city. In response a Tribune named Neapolitanus was sent by the Syrian Legate to make inquiries. He saw the miseries of the people and how they had been treated by the governor, and having urged them to keep the peace, and done reverence to Jehovah in the Temple, returned to his chief. This was succeeded by a long and weighty speech by Agrippa II, in which he pleaded with the people to avoid war with the Romans. He acknowledged the oppressions under which they suffered, but reminded them that in due course Florus would be withdrawn, and in any case resistance could not possibly be successful. This calmed the minds of the majority at first, but when the king went on to urge obedience to their oppressor, they could bear no more. Provoked by their obstinacy Agrippa left them in anger and returned to his own kingdom.

[1] *War*, II. xiv. 5.

Chapter IX

THE WAR AND DESTRUCTION OF THE JEWISH STATE

The rest of the story is merely a record of the rapid descent to the abyss. The fortress of Masada, on the shores of the Dead Sea, was seized by the party of violence. The Roman garrison was slain and, later, the weapons in the armoury distributed among the insurgents. Then Eleazar, a young man who was the son of Ananias, the high-priest, and himself governor of the Temple, dissuaded the priests from offering sacrifices for foreigners or even accepting their gifts.[1] This was obviously intended as a blow against the authority of the Emperor, and Josephus regards it as an open declaration of war. Influential persons who desired peace had endeavoured to prevent this open act of defiance, but the time for moderation had gone by. Thoroughly alarmed, the 'moderates' now sought to secure their own safety with Florus and Agrippa by urging them to intervene at once and save the nation from its impending ruin. Agrippa did, indeed, despatch 3,000 men, but they were of little avail. War was inevitable, and both sides hastened to prepare for it in earnest. Under the impelling influence of the Zealots almost every one had at last been brought to recognize that it was the only way out, though to many it was obvious from the first that it meant ruin.

We do not propose to recount in detail the full history of this catastrophic ending of the Jewish State, and indeed it is by no means easy to follow its developments in strict order. All that will be attempted is an outline of its salient features.

On the Jewish side Eleazar became leader of the Zealot party, and Manahem of the Sicarii, the more violent section. Vespasian, then an Imperial Legate, and his son Titus, were the Roman leaders. Beginning in A.D. 66, with an interval of two years, the conflict lasted until A.D. 70, ending in the complete

[1] *War*, II. xvii. 2.

victory of the Romans and the total destruction of the city and Temple of Jerusalem. Among the outstanding Jewish leaders were Josephus, the historian, who for a short time commanded in Galilee, but was soon captured and placed in amicable captivity; John of Gischala, who became a leader of the Zealot party; the high-priest Ananus; and Joseph of Gorion. It was Nero's death in June A.D. 68, and the confusion which followed, that caused a cessation of war for nearly two years. Then, when Vespasian had been appointed Emperor, he handed over Palestinian affairs to his son Titus, who captured Jerusalem after a five-months' siege, in September A.D. 70, being greatly helped by factions among the Jews themselves.

From the very outset the *Jews quarrelled with each other*, and Jerusalem itself soon became a regular battlefield. There was still a party of a less violent type, called for distinction the peace party, who occupied the Upper City, the Lower City and Temple being held by the more violent, or war party. As one would expect, the Sicarii, being the most violent of all, joined the latter. The palaces of moderates like the high-priest Ananias, Agrippa, Berenice, and many of the nobles were burned to the ground. Then the archives and creditor bonds were also committed to the flames. The Antonia Citadel was seized and its garrison slain, despite the promise of safety. At first Manahem, the leader of the Sicarii, directed the siege of the Upper City, but becoming too dictatorial even for his fellow-desperadoes, he was slain by the Zealots together with many of his adherents.[1] Presently Gallus, the Legate of Syria, intervened with a considerable army, but this only led to a Roman disaster and inflamed the Jews with delusive expectations.[2]

Then it was that the serious business of war began, and the Jews at length drew together in their danger—for a time.

Galilee was the first object of the Roman attack, the names of its most famous sieges being Jotapata, Taricheae, Gamala, and Gischala. With the capture of the last-named, John, its famous son, escaped to join his friends in Jerusalem, with the result that that unfortunate city was brought into worse confusion than ever. The extremists, never agreeing with the moderates for long, at last exterminated many of their leaders.

[1] *War*, II. xvii. 7–10. [2] *War*, II. xix. 2–9.

Then a dispute arose about the mode of succession to the high-priestly office, the Zealots desiring to capture this supreme post in the interests of their own party. But the moderates roused the people against the Zealots, and the latter were forced to shut themselves up in the Temple area for safety. In revenge, these men of violence induced the Idumeans to come in to their help, and a great slaughter ensued among the high-priestly party and the citizens. But the Idumeans, finding themselves deceived as to the real purpose of their errand, disappeared as quickly and suddenly as they came, and the Zealots again took over entire control. Anarchy now reigned in the city ; the Zealots set up a new Sanhedrin, only to disband it again when they discovered that it declined to be as subservient as they had hoped.[1]

Outside Jerusalem the Sicarii, under Simon bar Giora of Gerasa, were running riot, intent only on gaining profit from the disasters which had come upon the land. No city or village left by the Romans escaped their devastations. Though at first opposed by the Zealots, they were at last invited into the city to assist them against John, one of their own leaders, against whose tyranny a mutiny had broken out.

Siege and Fall of Jerusalem

The Romans, adopting the prudent policy of allowing the Jewish factions to effect their own destruction, meanwhile contented themselves with gaining possession of the rest of the country.[2] At last Titus thought the time was ripe to pluck the fruit, and advanced to the siege of Jerusalem. This began in the spring of A.D. 70 and lasted five months. He found, as he anticipated, that the internal factions had left the city ill-prepared to resist his determined attack. So much of their time had been spent in contending with each other that they had greatly lessened their power to offer united opposition to the foe. The Zealots now sternly repressed all internal inclination to surrender, clinging pathetically to the belief that somehow their efforts would evoke Providential intervention, probably by the appearance of the Messiah.[3] At last the inevitable happened : city and Temple were utterly destroyed and thousands of the inhabitants massacred. John of Gischala was sentenced to imprisonment for life, and he and Simon bar

[1] Cf. *War*, IV. iii–vi. [2] *War*, IV. ix. 1 ff. [3] *War*, VI. v. 2 ff.

Giora were reserved to grace a Roman triumph.[1] The destruction of Jerusalem meant the real termination of the war, though a few strongholds held out a little longer. The last to yield was Masada, taken in April A.D. 73, held to the last gasp by the Sicarii, under the leadership of Eleazar, a descendant of Judas of Galilee.

Zealotism was crushed, and in its fall not only brought down the whole Jewish State, but inflicted disabilities on Jews wherever found. The old consideration for their peculiar susceptibilities was now almost entirely abandoned and Jew-baiting became a favourite sport. They were henceforth required to pay their ancient Temple-tax in support of the Temple of Jupiter Capitolinus, though for the most part permitted to adhere to their own faith. Incidental disturbances broke out from time to time, but the penalties imposed more than met the needs of the situation. At Alexandria, for instance, Vespasian punished their restlessness by ordering the destruction of the Temple of Jehovah built by Onias 243 years before. In the reign of Trajan (98–117) the old spirit once again showed itself to be alive, rebellions occurring simultaneously in Egypt, Cyrene, Cyprus, and even Mesopotamia. The latest and most serious outbreak of all is that known by the name of its leader—Simon bar Cochba. Circumcision had been forbidden, and the Romans were also proposing to rebuild the forsaken city of Jerusalem and make it a Roman colony. About A.D. 131 the trouble began, appropriately enough in Judea, and attained a measure of success for a time. But Severus, the Roman general, finally overthrew the rebels with terrible slaughter. The war, if such it can be called, lasted about three and a half years, and at its conclusion captured Jews were sold as slaves. Jerusalem was then rebuilt and named Aelia Capitolina. On the site of the ancient Temple a pagan temple was erected dedicated to Jupiter Capitolinus. No Jew was permitted to enter the city. Thus the end had come at last.

[1] *War*, v. v. 6.

Chapter X

JESUS AND ZEALOTISM

So far as we know Jesus never came into clear and open contact with the Zealots as a party. The reason is not far to seek. Since the outbreak of insurrection under Judas in A.D. 6 (or 7), and its terrible suppression, the party had been driven underground. Perhaps, too, some credit must be given to the milder and saner government of the Roman procurators. Whether Simon, one of the apostles, was a member of this party, as is generally supposed, or not, his Zealot views, if he held them, never come into discussion nor are any Zealot actions ascribed to him. Moreover, the party, as it became known to later history, had yet to develop its most notorious characteristics, and this only came about under the terrible persecutions of the later procurators. Speaking comparatively, therefore, the Zealots were inactive and quiescent in the time of Jesus. His connexion with the movement, therefore, had to do with its underlying spirit rather than with its activities.

Yet the spirit of Zealotism only slumbered, and, as a theory, resistance to the Sovereign Power seemed to large numbers of the people a necessary preliminary to the inauguration of the Kingdom of God. Against this idea Jesus waged war whenever opportunity offered. It had as its background the glamour of the Maccabean struggle. These heroes in their dire distress had taken their courage in both hands, and after enormous sacrifices covered themselves and their land with everlasting glory. Was it not now laid upon their successors to follow their lead? Many refused to accept this view, but even they held to the temporal and political conception of the 'Kingdom,' though not forgetting its religious elements. It is important, therefore, to discriminate between Zealotism with its violence and this much commoner political idea. The former certainly

includes the latter, but the latter does not of necessity embrace the former. We are generally on safe ground in interpreting many of Christ's observations as directed against the religio-political conception, but it would often be straining the sense of the passages to regard them as having in view the Zealots also. Further, it is to be remarked that, whereas the reader of the New Testament is often enough in error in applying the teaching of Jesus to the personal and individual life, it would be equally erroneous to go to the opposite extreme and suppose Him to have in mind on all occasions public affairs.

Let us now examine in detail some possible allusions to Zealotism.

I. The Temptations of Jesus[1]

These are usually regarded as dealing mainly with His own personal life and conduct. Thus the temptation to create bread was an inducement to escape from the customary inconveniences and hardships which are the lot of the ordinary man ; that which deals with the kingdoms of the world was a temptation to compromise with the lower ideals even of the religiously-minded around Him, and perhaps contains as well an allusion to the political conception of the Kingdom ; and the suggestion to throw Himself down from the pinnacle of the Temple was a temptation to presume on His peculiar relationship to God. Some writers, however, e.g. Stephen Liberty, see in each temptation a reference to the political ideas of the time. In the last of the three this writer finds an allusion to Zealotism. ' To be recognized as Son of God by us, to fulfil a national rôle at this juncture, you will have to lead the way in a desperate, apparently suicidal, act. Of your own accord throw yourself and the people down from the position of security that you have, to meet the dangers that surround you.'[2] In support of this view he quotes D. S. Margoliouth : ' It was a desperate and reckless experiment by which the Zealots meant to settle for ever the question whether the Jehovah of whom they boasted was or was not on a par with the Bels and Nebos ridiculed by their prophets as unable to defend their worshippers or their shrines, and carried into captivity with the nations who served them.'[3] As a statement

[1] Matt. iv. 1–11 ; Luke iv. 1–12.
[2] Liberty, *Political Relations of Christ's Ministry*, p. 62 f.
[3] Introd. to *Works of Fl. Josephus* (Routledge, 1906), p. ix.

of Zealot views this is true enough, but there is room for doubt whether this is all implied in the temptation referred to. There was no immediate pressure of this kind on Jesus, whereas the merely political idea of the Kingdom was never far away from men's minds ; it seems therefore safer to regard the suggestion made as dealing with the nearer rather than with the remoter danger.[1] Still, the Zealot solution was undoubtedly in the background.

II. The Baptist's Conception of the Messiah and His Kingdom

John's preaching was certainly of a stern and somewhat forbidding order, suggesting traits of the Zealot spirit. Thus : 'Even now is the axe laid unto the root of the trees : every tree therefore that bringeth not forth good fruit is hewn down and cast into the fire . . . the chaff he will burn up with unquenchable fire.'[2] But it seems better to look to the national iniquity as the object of the preacher's reproof rather than the Romans, and to God as the avenger rather than the sword of the Zealots. On the other hand we have to remember the question John sent to Jesus from the prison and the response he received.[3] What could his difficulty about Jesus be unless it were that He refrained from violent methods ? One notes also that in His reply Jesus carefully cites among His deeds everything of a milder and gentler character, as if to win John over, if possible, from another and different kind of expectation. It is not a little remarkable, too, that Jesus should have believed it necessary to defend John's reputation in the presence of the crowd, which probably sympathized with the Baptist's point of view. Was it that Jesus seized the opportunity to correct the error of both prophet and crowd at one and the same time ? Cheyne's observation that, 'though neither of them (i.e. Jesus and John) favoured the violent plans of Zealots and revolutionists, secular rulers could not help suspecting them,'[4] while probably true enough, seems to disregard the more aggressive spirit of the Baptist as revealed in this incident.

[1] Cf. Wernle, *Beg. of Christianity*, i. 47 ; D. Smith, *Days of His Flesh*, p. 36.
[2] Matt. iii. 10, 12.
[3] Matt. xi. 2–19 ; Luke vii. 18–35.
[4] Art. 'John the Baptist,' *E. B.*, col. 2503.

III. Choice of Simon the Zealot, or Cananaean[1]

The choice of this Simon as a member of the band of apostles has given rise to much discussion. Some interpret the term 'Zealot' as 'zealous for the Law,' as in Acts xxi. 20. Thus Swete: 'As the first Simon was "rock-like," so the second was characterized by jealousy for what he conceived to be right or true.'[2] Lagrange and Knabenhauer hold a similar view. But nowhere have we any indication or illustration of this in his life, and presumably he must have possessed this quality in a high degree to have won the appellation as a perpetual designation. The reasons against his being a member of the Zealot party are of course obvious enough. To choose a man from such a doubtful quarter was certainly a very bold thing to do. It was calculated not only to compromise Jesus in the eyes of the Roman authorities, but, what to Him was even more to be avoided, create misunderstanding among the people as to the character of His work and mission. It may certainly be argued that though Simon had once belonged to this party he no longer did so, and his 'Zealotry, purified by the knowledge of Jesus, might readily become true loyalty to the Kingdom of God.'[3] But this does not remove the initial danger of creating misunderstanding and opprobrium in different quarters. Of the danger to the disciples themselves there can be little doubt. One cannot forget that at a later stage, in response to Christ's equivocal words on the coming dangers, two swords were produced at very short notice by the disciples, and that when Jesus was in danger of arrest Peter cut off the ear of one of the offenders with a sword which he evidently had at hand.[4] The danger of misunderstanding was, therefore, real enough. Possibly one may conclude that then as now Jesus found some of His best material among men of fiery spirit (witness the 'sons of thunder'), and that in this case, as in the calling of 'publicans and sinners,' He deliberately ran all risks in the belief that such men might be moulded and fashioned for a better purpose.[5]

[1] Called Zealot in Luke vi. 15 and Acts i. 13; Cananaean in Mark iii. 18, and Matt. x. 3.

[2] Swete, *Com. Mark*, p. 62. [3] Art. 'Zealot,' by Titchmarsh, *D. C. G.*, ii. 846.

[4] Luke xxii. 38; Mark xiv. 47; Matt. xxvi. 51; Luke xxii. 49.

[5] Among those who regard Simon as a member of the Zealot party are Wellhausen, Loisy, Gould, and Plummer.

IV. The Request of James and John[1]

'And they said unto Him, Grant us that we may sit, one on Thy right hand and one on Thy left hand in Thy glory.' It seems quite clear that the question had a political background, though it can hardly have been Zealotism. But with men of their temper,[2] for they were commonly known as the 'sons of thunder,' such a spirit was capable in the circumstances of the coming time of developing in perilous directions. Hence, perhaps, the clear and unqualified statement by Jesus of the difference between His Kingdom and that of all others, both in the objects sought and the spirit in which they were pursued. In His Kingdom there could be no favouritism, God would assign to every man his place; and there would be no empty honours of which men might boast, the only honour being a larger opportunity of service: 'Whosoever would be first among you shall be bondservant of all.'

V. Question *re* giving Tribute to Caesar[3]

The questioners consisted of a deputation holding different views on the point at issue, though united for the moment in antagonism to Jesus. On the one hand were the Sadducees (in the background) and Herodians, who would themselves have answered the question in a compromising manner; and on the other the various types of Pharisees, among whom would be some probably glad enough to find in the young Galilean a sympathizer with the more aggressive attitude towards the common foe. In his answer Jesus showed Himself not only an excellent disputant, but entirely unwilling to sound the note of national resistance to Rome. The Jews had made their bargain when they asked for procuratorial government, and they must now keep to it. Whatever else His teaching stood for, He made it perfectly clear that it had no connexion with Zealot fanaticism. At a later stage, when the Sadducees brought Jesus before Pilate it was this same line of attack which was chosen. Their disappointment therefore on the present occasion can be imagined.

[1] Mark x. 35–45; Matt. xx. 20–28. [2] Luke ix. 54 f.
[3] Mark xii. 13–17; Matt. xxii. 15–22; Luke xx. 19–26; see also above, Pt. I. viii. (i.) 6.

VI. The Triumphal Entry into Jerusalem[1]

The perplexing feature of this incident is that it seems to have been arranged by Jesus Himself. At all other times His whole endeavour was to avoid attracting men's attention in this spectacular fashion. Yet, according to each of the Synoptists, He here invites it. The explanation usually given for this change of front is that this was His final claim to Messiahship. But if this method was likely to succeed now, why was it not tried before, and why was not the rôle maintained a little longer? And if the Zealots had accepted Him in their own sense as deliverer, what would have happened next? The usual explanation seems to overlook the fact this so-called Triumphal Entry was a plain and open contradiction of the Zealot idea of the coming deliverer. To achieve their ends He must come with trumpets and clash of arms, ready to storm Roman strongholds by physical force. Perhaps some of Christ's followers thought that He might some day justify this expectation. What, then, so likely as that on some suitable occasion He should give ocular demonstration of the kind of king He actually was—gentle, mild, peaceful—and so destroy for ever false hopes respecting Himself, whether among His disciples or others? Viewed from this standpoint the incident has its part in Christ's exposition of the nature of His Kingdom, showing its entire separation from Zealotism.

VII. Certain Significant Sayings and Practices

The reader of the New Testament is often struck with the practice of Jesus in withdrawing from public notice immediately following His miraculous deeds, His refusal to allow demons (or the demon-possessed) to testify of Him, and His disappearance when, according to the author of the Fourth Gospel, the people would have attempted to make Him king.[2] He was opposed even to the mildest form of mob-movement, apparently seeing its dangers and also its futility.

Again, His description of His Kingdom as universal in its range was a blow to the narrower spirit of Jewish nationalism so common at that time. Of the same type are such characterizations as that the Kingdom was 'not of this world: if My kingdom were of this world then would My servants fight'[3]; the

[1] Mark xi. 1–10; Matt. xxi. 1–9; Luke xix. 29–38; John xii. 12–15.

[2] Mark i. 38, 34; John vi. 15. [3] John xviii. 36.

kingdom is ' within you,' or ' among you.' Of a similar tenor is His warning against mistaken and alarmist expectations of the Messiah's return : ' If any man shall say unto you, Lo, here is the Christ ; or Lo, there ; believe it not : for there shall arise false Christs and false prophets, and shall show signs and wonders, that they may lead astray, if possible, the elect.'[1] After the Resurrection the disciples' minds were still intent on this matter, and again He sought to allay their feverish expectation : ' It is not for you to know times or seasons which the Father hath set within His own authority.'[2] The passage in Matthew in which Jesus promises His disciples that they ' shall sit on twelve thrones, judging the twelve tribes of Israel,' again mentioned in a different connexion by Luke,[3] is manifestly strongly Apocalyptic in character, and it is not without significance that it is omitted in the Marcan narrative.[4]

Other sayings of Jesus also go to show His antagonism to the Zealot spirit. Such are those which emphasize the virtue of endurance, e.g. ' And ye shall be hated of all men for My name's sake : but he that endureth to the end the same shall be saved ' ; again, referring to the distresses and tumults which are approaching, Jesus assures His disciples : ' In your patience ye shall win your souls.'[5] Another well-known exhortation, ' Resist not him that is evil ' may even refer directly to the Roman authority, but in any case includes it.[6] Again, Christ's disapproval of violent methods could not be made clearer than in His treatment of one of Pilate's cruel outbursts : ' Some . . . told Him of the Galileans whose blood Pilate had mingled with their sacrifices.' What might He not have said in condemnation of such an outrage ! But by saying it, however much the deed deserved it, He would only have added fuel to the fire. Instead, He simply replies : ' Except ye repent, ye shall all in like manner perish.'[7]

Jesus an Anti-Zealot

One passage remains to be considered, about whose interpretation there is great disagreement among exegetes. As given in Matthew it runs : ' And from the days of John the Baptist

[1] Mark xiii. 21 f. [2] Acts i. 6 f. [3] Matt. xix. 28 ; cf. Luke xxii. 29 f.
[4] Cf. Mark x. 28–31 ; Luke xviii. 28–30. [5] Matt. x. 22 ; Luke xxi. 19.
[6] Matt. v. 39 ; cf. an art. by H. M. Hughes in *Expos. Times*, xxvii. 151, where he argues with much force for the reference to the Roman Power.
[7] Luke xiii. 1–3.

until now the kingdom of heaven suffereth violence, and men of violence take it by force.'[1] Luke has the same saying in another connexion, but one not so probable as that of Matthew.[2] Who were the 'men of violence,' and how were they attempting to take the kingdom 'by force'? Cheyne denies the supposed reference to the Zealots, and amends the text so as to make it read 'preach the gospel' instead of 'take it by force,' but to do this he uses a word[3] only once used by Matthew elsewhere. Resch supposes a different word in the Aramaic or Hebrew original, meaning 'law-breaker,' so making it refer to publicans and harlots.[4] Dalman prefers to explain it as referring to the violence which began with the imprisonment of the Baptist. 'It is its peculiarity that the theocracy suffers violence, not, of course, from believers, but from those in authority.'[5] Keeping close to its association with the Baptist the passage may have two references: the first points to the shallow but widespread response[6] which John's ministry met with at first on the part of all classes of the community, those who imagined they possessed prescriptive rights to enter the Kingdom being perhaps particularly thought of; the second reference was probably to John's own mistaken idea, shared by numbers of the people, that different and more violent methods were necessary to the establishment of the Kingdom for which he longed so ardently.[7] But neither found favour with Jesus. He toiled on in His own way, escaping shallow popularity by His moral demands and avoiding the violence and fury of physical force by His intense spirituality. Jesus was an anti-Zealot.

[1] Matt. xi. 12; cf. Luke xvi. 16. [2] So Lagrange, ad loc.
[3] For *βιάζεται* he suggests *εὐαγγελίζεται*. (Art. 'John the Baptist,' *E. B.*, col. 2502.)
[4] The word proposed is פרץ, thus *βιασταί*=פריצים i.e. law-breakers.
[5] Dalman, *Words of Jesus*, p. 142. [6] Cf. Hort. *Judaistic Christianity*, p. 26.
[7] Cf. D. Smith, *Days of His Flesh*, p. 227.

ABBREVIATIONS

Those used for the Books of the Bible, the Apocrypha, and the Pseudepigrapha are too well known to be mentioned.

Apoc. & Pseud.	Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha, edited by R. H. Charles.
Aram.	Aramaic.
B. D. B.	Hebrew Lexicon, by Brown, Driver, and Briggs.
B. O. N. T.	Between the Old and New Testaments, by R. H. Charles.
C. B. S. C.	Cambridge Bible for Schools and Colleges.
Centy. B.	Century Bible Commentaries.
D. A. C.	Hastings' Dictionary of the Apostolic Church.
D. B.	Smith's Dictionary of the Bible.
D. C. G.	Hastings' Dictionary of Christ and the Gospels.
E. B. (or Bib.)	Encyclopaedia Biblica, edited by Cheyne and Black.
E. Brit.	Encyclopaedia Britannica.
E. G. T.	Expositor's Greek Testament, edited by W. R. Nicoll.
E. R. E.	Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics, edited by Hastings.
Expos.	Expositor, edited by S. Cox, W. R. Nicoll, and J. Moffatt.
Expos. T.	Expository Times, edited by Hastings.
H. D. B.	Hastings' Dictionary of the Bible.
I. C. C.	International Critical Commentary.
J. E.	Jewish Encyclopaedia.
J. P. T. J. C. ..	Jewish People in the Time of Jesus Christ, by Schürer.
J. Q. R.	Jewish Quarterly Review.
J. R. L. E.	Jewish Religious Life after the Exile, by Cheyne.
LXX	Septuagint.
N.H.	New or late Hebrew.
Pa.	Pael of the verb.
Pi.	Piel of the verb.
P. R. E.	Real Encyclopaedie für Prot. Theol. und Kirche.
Prov. R. E. ..	Provinces of the Roman Empire, by Mommsen.
Syr.	Syriac.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Abelson, J. ..... art. Shammai, in E. R. E.

Abrahams, I. ..... art. Sanhedrin, in E. R. E.; Studies in Pharisaism and the Gospels (1917).

Allen, W. C. ..... Com. on Matthew (I. C. C. 1907).

Angus, S. ..... Environment of Early Christianity (1915); art. Zealots, in E. R. E.

Ayles, H. H. B. .... art. Our Lord's refutation of the Sadducees, in Expos. VI. xi.

Bacher, W. ..... arts. Johanan ben Zakkai, in J. E.; Sanhedrin, in J. E., and in H. D. B.

Bacon, B. W. ..... art. Elias and the Men of Violence, in Expos. VI. vi.

Baethgen, Fr. ..... Com. Die Psalmen (1897).

Baldensperger, W. .. Das Selbstbewusstsein Jesu (1892).

Bartlett, J. V..... The Apostolic Age (1902).

Batten, Loring W. .. Com. on Ezra and Nehemiah (I. C. C. 1913).

Bennett, W. H. .... Post-Exilic Prophets (1907).

Benzinger, I. ..... art. Government, in E. Bib.

Bernard, J. H. .... Com. on the Pastoral Epistles (C. G. T. 1899).

Bertholet, A. ..... art. Religious-Historical Prob. of Later Judaism, in Trans. 3rd Congr. Hist. Religions, vol. 1; Die Stellung der Israeliten u. d. Juden zu d. Fremden (1896); Jud. Relig. von der Zeit Esdras bis zum Zeitalter Christi (1911).

Bevan, E. ..... Jerusalem under the High Priests (1904).

Beveridge, W. ..... art. Ebionism, in E. R. E.

Bogle, A. N. ..... art. Gerizim, in D. C. G.

Bousset, W. ..... Die Religion des Judentums (1906); Jesus (1906); Jesu Predigt in ihrem Gegensatz zum Judentum (1892).

Box, C. H. ..... Relig. and Worship of Synagogue (1907); art. Pharisees, in E. R. E.; art. Sadducees, in E. R. E.; arts. in Expos., Ser. VIII. xv., xvi., xxiv.; arts. in Rev. Theol. & Philos., Sept. 1908, August, 1910; Com. on 4 Ezra in Apoc. & Pseud., vol. ii.; Com. on the Ezra Apocalypse (1912); Com. on the Apoc. of Abraham (1918).

Brandt, W. ..... art. Elkesaites, in E. R. E.

Briggs, C. A. ..... Com. on Psalms (I. C. C. 1906).

Browne, L. E. ..... Early Judaism (1921).

Bruce, A. B. ..... The Kingdom of God (1896); Com. on Synoptic Gospels (E. G. T.)

Büchler, A. ..... Das Synedrion-Jerusalem (1902); Das galiläische 'Am-ha-'Arets (1906); art. Law of Purification in Mark vii., in Expos. T. xxi.

Buhl, F. ..... art. New Testament Times, in H. D. B.

Burkitt, F. C. ..... Jewish and Christian Apocalypses (1914); art. Assumption of Moses, in H. D. B.

Burton, H. ..... Christ and the Samaritans, in Expos. I. vi.

Case, S. J. ..... arts. Theudas, Tribute, in D. A. C.

Caspari, W. ..... Die Pharisäer (1909).

Chapman, A. T. .... Introduction to the Pentateuch (1911).

Charles, R. H..... Coms. on various vols. in Apoc. & Pseud.; Coms. on Enoch, Secrets of Enoch (with Morfill), Apoc. of Baruch, Assumption of Moses, Ascension of Isaiah, Book of Jubilees, Testaments of the xii. Patriarchs; Between the Old and New Testaments (1914); Eschatology (1899 and 1913); art. Apocalyptic Literature, in E. Bib.

Cheyne, T. K. .... Possible Zoroast. Influences on Relig. of Israel, in Expos. T. ii.; Prophecies of Isaiah (1884); Jewish Religious Life after the Exile (1898); Origin of the Psalter (1891).

Christie, W. M. .... art. Samaria, Samaritans, in D. C. G.

Chwolson, D. ..... Beiträge zur Entwick. des Judentums (1910); Das letze Passamahl Christi (1908).

Conybeare, F. C..... art. Essenes, in H. D. B.

Cowley, A. E. ..... arts. Sadducees, Samaritans, in E. Bib.; art. Samaritan Doctrine of the Messiah, in Expos. V. i.; art. The Samaritan Liturgy &c., in J. Q. R. New Ser. vii.; art. Samaritan Literature and Religion, in J. Q. R. New Ser. viii.; art. Samaritans, in J. E. and E. Brit. (11th ed.).

Curtis, E. L. ..... Com. on Chronicles (I. C. C.).

Curtiss, S. I. ..... Primitive Semitic Religion To-day, App. F (1902).

Dalman, G. ..... The Words of Jesus (1902).

Davidson, A. B. .... Old Testament Prophecy (1903); Theol. of the O.T. (1904).

Deissmann, G. A. .. Bible Studies (1903).

Denney, J. ..... art. Sadducees and Immortality, in Expos. IV. x.; art. Law in the New Testament, in H. D. B.

Derenbourg, J. .... Histoire de la Palestine (1867).
Dimont, C. T. .... art. Synop. Evangelists and Pharisees, in Expos. VIII. i.
Dods, M. ..... art. The Baptist's Message to Jesus, in Expos. V. i.
Driver, S. R. ..... art. Sabbath, in H. D. B.; Com. on Deuteronomy (I. C. C.); Com. on Daniel (C. B. S. C.).
Drummond, James . Philo Judaeus (1888).
Duchesne, L. ..... Early History of the Christian Church (1909).

Eaton, D. ..... arts. Pharisees, Scribes, and Sadducees, in H. D. B.
Edersheim, A. ..... Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah (1900); Sketches of Jewish Social Life (1876); History of the Jewish Nation (1896).
Eerdmans, B. D. .. art. Pharisees and Sadducees, in Expos. VIII. viii.
Elbogen, J. ..... Die Religionsanschauungen der Pharisäer (1904).
Emmet, C. W. .... art. Messiah, in E. R. E.
Ewald, H. ..... History of Israel (1869).

Fairbairn, A. M. .. art. Jesus and the Jews, in Expos. I. viii.
Fairweather, W. .... The Background of the Gospels (1908); art. Development of Doctrine in Apoc. Period, in H. D. B.
Farrar, F. W. ..... arts. Exile and Origin of Pharisaism; Christ and Oral Law, in Expos. I. v.
Friedländer, M. .... Die religiösen Bewegungen, &c. (1905); art. The Rupture between Alex. Jannai and the Pharisees, in J. Q. R. New Ser. iv. 444.

Gardner, P. ..... art. Quirinius, in E. Bib.
Garrod, H. W. ..... Religion of All Good Men, App. C (1906).
Garvie, A. E. ..... art. Judgement of Relig. Rulers and Teachers, in Expos. VI. vi.
Gaster, M. ..... art. Ordination, in E. R. E.; art. Popular Judaism and Samaritan Traditions, in Transactions 3rd Congr. Histor. Religions, vol. i.
Geiger, A. ..... Sadducäer und Pharisäer (1863).
Ginsburg, C. D. .... The Essenes: their History and Doctrines (1864).
Gould, E. P. ..... Com. on Mark (I. C. C.).
Graetz, H. ..... History of the Jews (1888).
Gray, G. B. ..... art. Psalms of Solomon, in D. A. P.
Guthe, H. ..... art. Israel, in E. Bib.
Gwatkin, H. M. .... art. Roman Empire, in H. D. B.; Early Church History.

Hamburger ..... art. Essäer in Real Ency. für Bibel u. Tal.
Harnack, A. ..... The Sayings of Jesus (1907); Mission and Expansion of Christianity (1910); art. Some Laws of the Kingdom, in American S. S. Times, Jan. 15, 1910.
Hart, J. H. A. .... art. Sadducees, in E. Brit.; art. Scribes of the Nazarenes, in Expos. VII. i., ii., iii.; art. Corban, in J. Q. R. (July, 1907).
Hausrath, A. ..... History of N.T. Times (1878).
Headlam, A. C. .... arts. Gnosticism, Herod, Bk. of Jubilees, Procurator, Province, Simon Magus, Theudas, in H. D. B.; Life and Teaching of Jesus Christ (1923).
Herford, R. T. .... Pharisaism: Its Aims and Methods (1912); Effect of Fall of Jerus. on Pharisees (1917); What the World owed to the Pharisees; art. Christ in Jewish Literature, in D. C. G.; Com. on Pirke Aboth in Apoc. & Pseud.
Hirsch, E. G. ..... art. Hillel, in E. R. E.
Hollmann, G. ..... Jewish Religion in the Time of Jesus (1909).
Hölscher, G. ..... Der Sadduzäismus (1906).
Hoonacker, A. van.. Com. on Les Douze Petits Prophètes (1908); Une Communauté Judéo-Aram. à Eléphantiné (1915).
Hort, F. J. A. .... Judaistic Christianity (1898).
Hughes, H. M. .... Ethics of Apoc. Literature (1910); art. Anti-Zealotism in Gospels, in Expos. T. xxvii.
Hyamson, M. ..... Review of Husband's The Prosecution of Jesus, in J. Q. R. New Ser. xi.

Jackson (Foakes) and Lake (Kirsopp) .. Beginnings of Christianity, Pt. I., vol. i. (1920).
James, M. I. ..... art. Apocrypha, in E. Bib.
Jones, Maurice .... art. The Hellenistic World behind N.T., in Expos. VIII. xxi.
Jones, Stuart ..... The Roman Empire (1908).
Jülicher, A. ..... art. Essenes, in E. Bib.

Kautsch, E. ..... art. Samaritaner, in Herzog's R. E.; Die Apocryphen u. Pseudepigraphen des A.T. (1900).
Keim, T. ..... Jesus of Nazara.
Kennedy, H. A. A. art. Functions of the Forerunner, &c., in Expos. VII. vi.
Kennett, R. H. .... art. Israel, in E. R. E.
Kent, C. F. ..... Makers and Teachers of Judaism (1911).

Kirkup and Stock . art. Essenes, in E. Brit. (11th ed.).
Knowling, R. J. .. Coms. on Acts of Apos. in E. G. T. (1900); on James (1904).
Kohler, K. ..... arts. Pharisees, Sadducees, Haber, Essenes, Zealots in J. E.; art. Sanhedrin, in D. A. C.; Jewish Theology (1918).
Kosters, W. H. .... art. Ezra, in E. B.
König, E. ..... art. Samaritan Pentateuch, in H. D. B.
Kuenen, A. ..... Religion of Israel (1874); National Religions and Universal Religions (1882).

Lagrange, M. J. .... Le Messianisme chez les Juifs (1909); Coms. on Marc (1920) and Luc (1921).
Lake, Kirsopp .... Stewardship of Faith (1915).
Lambert, J. C. .... arts. Cananaean, Claims of Christ, in D. C. G.
Lauterbach, Jac. Z. art. Sadducees and Pharisees, in Studies in Jewish Liter. (1913); arts. Midrash and Mishnah, in J. Q. R. New Ser. v. and vi.
Leszynsky, R. .... Die Sadduzäer (1912).
Liberty, Stephen .. art. Pharisees, Herodians, &c., in Expos. T. xxviii.; Political Relations of Christ's Ministry (1916).
Lightfoot, J. B. .... Com. on Colossians and Philemon: Introd. and Dissertations (1890).
Loewe, H. M. J. .... art. Judaism, in E. R. E.
Lucius, P. E..... Der Essenismus (1881).

M'Neile, A. H. .... Com. on Matthew (1915).
Mackenzie, W. D. .. art. Jesus Christ, in E. R. E.
Mahaffy, J. P..... Alexander's Empire (1887).
Mann, Jacob ..... art. Jesus and the Sadducean Priests, in J. Q. R. New Ser. vi.
Margoliouth, D. S. .. art. Zadokites, in Expos. VIII. vi.
Margoliouth, G. .... art. Sadducean Christians of Damascus, in Expos. VIII. ii.; arts. on Zadokite Documents, in Expos. T. xxiii., xxiv., xxv.; art. The Traditions of the Elders, in Expos. T. xxii.
Marti, Karl ..... Das Dodekapropheton (1904).
Martin, François .. Le Livre d'Hénoch (1906).
Matthews, S. ..... History of N.T. Times in Palestine (1910); art. Judas the Galilaean, in D. A. C.
Meyer, E. ..... Die Entstehung des Judenthums (1896).
Micklem, P. A. .... Com. on Matthew (1917).
Mitchell, Jos. ..... arts. Sadducees, Scribes, in D. C. G.
Mitchell, Smith, Bewer ..... Com. on Haggai, Malachi, Zechariah, Jonah (I. C. C. 1912).

Moffatt, Jas. ..... art. The Righteousness of the Scribes and Pharisees, in Expos. T. xiii.; art. Post-exilic Judaism, in Expos. VI. viii.; arts. Scribes, Essenes, in E. R. E.; Introd. to the Literature of the N.T. (1920).

Mommsen, Th. .... History of Rome (1854–6); Provinces of the Roman Empire (1886); art. Christianity in the Roman Empire, in Expos. IV. viii.

Montefiore, C. G. .. art. Jewish Scholarship, in Hib. Journal, Jan., 1903; Com. on the Synoptic Gospels (1909); Religious Teaching of Jesus (1910).

Montet ..... Les Origines des Partis Sadd. et Phariséen (1883).

Montgomery, J. A... The Samaritans (1907).

Moore, G. F. ..... History of Religions, vol. ii. (1920).

Morrison, W. D. .. The Jews under Roman Rule (1890).

Moss, R. W. ..... art. Hasidaeans, in H. D. B.

Moulton, J. H. .... art. Zoroastrianism, in H. D. B.; art. Zoroastrian Influence on Judaism, in Expos. T. ix.

Moulton, Warren J. art. Samaritans, in E. R. E.

Niese, B. ..... art. Josephus, in E. R. E.

Niven, W. D. .... arts. Essenes, Gnosticism, Ebionism, Pharisees, Sadducees, Scribes, in D. A. C.

Nutt, J. W. ..... Sketch of Samaritan History, Dogma, and Literature (1874).

Oesterley, W. O. E. Com. on Ecclesiasticus (C. B. S. C. 1912); Doctrine of Last Things (1898); Books of the Apocrypha (1914); Evolution of the Messianic Idea (1908).

„ (with Box) .. Religion and Worship of the Synagogue (1907).

Peake, A. S. ..... art. Unclean, Uncleanness, in H. D. B.; art. Law, in D. C. G.

Peters, J. P. ..... Religion of the Hebrews (1914).

Plummer, A. ..... Coms. on Matthew (1909) and Luke (1896).

Plumptre, E. H. .. art. Samaritan Element in Gospels and Acts, in Expos. I. vii.

Prince, J. D. ..... art. Scribes and Pharisees, in E. Bib.

Rackham, R. B. .. Com. on Acts of Apos. (1910).

Ramsay, W. M. .. arts. Church and Empire in First Century, in Expos. IV. viii.; art. Census Lists of Quirinius and Augustus in Expos. VI. iv.; art. Luke's Narrative of the Birth of Christ, in Expos. VIII. iv.; Was Christ born at Bethlehem? (1898).

Renan, E. ..... Histoire du Peuple d'Israel (1889).

Reuss, Ed.	Christian Theol. in the Apostolic Age (1872).
Réville, A.	Jésus de Nazareth (1906).
Riggs, J. S.	Jewish People in Maccabean and Roman Periods (1900).
Robertson, A. T. ..	The Pharisees and Jesus (1920).
Robinson, T. H. ..	art. Jesus and the Pharisees, in Expos. T. xxviii.
Rothstein, J. W. ..	Juden und Samaritaner (1908).
Ryle and James ..	Com. on Psalms of the Pharisees (1891).
Schechter, S.	Studies in Judaism (1896); Some Aspects of Rabbinic Theology (1909); Fragments of a Zadokite Work (1910).
Schmidt, N.	art. Sects (Samaritan), in E. R. E.
Schmiedel, P. W. ..	arts. Judas of Galilee, Simon Magus, Theudas, in E. Bib.
Schrader, E.	Cuneiform Inscriptions and the Old Testament (1888).
Schürer, E.	Jewish People in the Time of Jesus Christ (1902).
Scott, C. Anderson	art. Essenes, in D. C. G.
Scott, E. F.	art. Gnosticism, in E. R. E.
Scott, H. M.	art. Pharisees, in D. C. G.
Segal, M. H.	art. Pharisees and Sadducees, in Expos. VIII. xiii.
Sieffert	art. Pharisäer, in Herzog's Real Ency.
Skinner, J.	Divine Names in Genesis (1914).
Socin	Baedekker's Palestine.
Souter, A.	arts. Ethnarch, Province, Roman Empire, in D. A. C.
Smend, R.	Alttest. religionsgeschichte (1899).
Smith, D.	art. The Good Samaritan, in D. C. G.
Smith, G. A.	Jerusalem (1907).
Smith, H. P.	Old Testament History (1903); Religion of Israel (1914).
Smith, W. R.	art. Samaritans, in E. Brit.
„ (with T. K. Cheyne)	art. Assideans, in E. Bib.
Stanley, A. P.	Jewish Church, vol. i., App. iii. (1862).
Stapfer, E.	Les Idées relig. en Pal. à l'époque de J. C. (1878); Jesus Christ (1896).
Stevens, G. B.	Theology of the New Testament (1899).
Strack and Billerbeck	Kommentar zum N.T. aus Talmud u. Midrasch (1922).
Strahan, J.	art. Samaria, in D. A. C.
Swete, H. B.	Com. on Mark (1908); Cambridge Biblical Essays (1909).
Taylor, C.	Sayings of the Jewish Fathers (1897).

Thomson, J. E. H. art. The Samaritans, in Expos. T. xi.; The Samaritans (1919).
Titchmarsh, E. H. art. Zealot, in E. Bib.
Torrey, C. C. ..... Composition and Historical Value of Ezra Nehemiah (1896).
Toy, C. H. ..... Judaism and Christianity (1890).

Viteau, J. ..... Com. on Les Psaumes de Salomon (1911).

Weir, T. H. ..... art. on Luke xx. 20, in Expos. T. xxviii.
Welch, A. C. .... A Zealot Pamphlet, in Expos. VIII. xxv.
Wellhausen, J. .... Die Pharisäer und Sadducäer (1874); art. Israel, in E. Brit.
Wendt, H. H. .... The Teaching of Jesus (1893).
Wernle, P. ..... Beginnings of Christianity (1903).
Westcott, B. F. .... Com. on Epp. of John, Excursus: The Two Empires (1892); Com. on St. John (1887); art. Essenes, in D. B.
Wiener, H. M. .... art. Samaritan Septuagint Massoretic Text, in Expos. VIII. ii.
Wilson, C. W. .... art. Samaria, in H. D. B.
Woodhouse, W. J. .. arts. Pontius Pilate, Herod, in E. Bib.
Wright, A. ..... Synopsis of the Gospels in Greek (1903).

Zeller, E. ..... Die Philosophie der Griechen (3rd ed.).

INDEX

A. SUBJECTS AND NAMES

(NOTE.—*Subjects referred to in the Synopsis are generally omitted here*)

A

Abbot-Smith, Lexicon N.T., 138
Abelson, J., Shammai (E. R. E.), 64
Abraham, Apocalypse of, 276
Abrahams, I., Pharisaism and Gospels, vol. i., 11, 114, 120, 148, 150
Abu'l Fath, 232
Alcimus, 56
Allen, W. C., Com. Matthew, 110, 144, 159, 252
Am-Ha-Aretz, 58 f.
Angels, names of, 99, 276, 298
Apocalyptic and Pharisees, 22, 62
Apoc. & Pseud. Literature, 14 f.

B

Baldensperger, W., Selbstbewusstsein Jesu, 77
Batten, L. W., 217
—— Com. Ezra-Nehemiah, 195, 201 ff.
Baur, F., 254, 277, 316
Benjamin of Tudela, 235
Bernard, J. H., Pastoral Epistles (C. G. T.), 321
Bertholet, A., 216
—— Die Stellung d. Israeliten u. d. Juden, &c., 226
Beveridge, W., Ebionism (E. R. E.), 322
Blass, Fr., 372
Bousset, W., Die Religion des Judentums, 57 f., 60, 85, 116, 344
—— Jesus, 320
Box, Canon, 27, 36, 73, 223
—— Pharisees (E. R. E.), 28, 45, 148
—— Sadducees (E. R. E.), 85, 97
—— Apocalypse of Abraham, 276, 290
—— Apoc. & Pseud., 276
—— arts. in Expositor, 56, 69, 78, 102, 140, 145, 275
—— art. in Review Theol. and Philos., 149
—— M.S. Lectures, 224
Brandt, W., Elkesaites (E. R. E.), 322
Briggs, C. A., Com. Psalms, 84
Browne, L. E., Early Judaism, 211
Bruce, A. B., Com. (E. G. T.), 126, 144, 156, 159 f., 164
—— Kingdom of God, 113, 151
Büchler, A., Das. Synhed. in Jerusalem, 63
—— Der gal. Am-ha-Arets, 149
—— Law of Purification (Expos. T.), 123
Budde, Karl, The Canon (E. B.), 224 f.
Buhl, F., New Testament Times (H. D. B.), 340
Burkitt, F. C., 349

C

Caspari, W., 36
Charles, R. H., 34, 275, 344
—— Apoc. & Pseud., 74, 84, 347, 349, 354
—— Between Old and New Testaments, 40, 91
—— Book of Enoch, 275
—— Book of Jubilees, 84
—— Testaments of XII Patriarchs, 86
—— Zadokite Fragments, 51
Chasidim (or Hasidim), 40, 56, 173
Cheyne, T. K., 195 f., 216, 275, 312
—— Com. Isaiah, 91, 209 f.
—— J. R. L. E., 198, 203, 208, 222
—— John the Baptist (E. B.), 390, 395
—— Origin of Psalms, 314, 316
—— Sanballat (E. B.), 201
Chwolson, D., 36, 146
—— Das letze Passamahl Christi, 134, 162
Clemen, 372
Clement, 379
Conybeare, F. C., Essenes (H. D. B.), 317, 319
Cowley, A. E., 31
—— Sadducees (E. B.), 19, 33, 55, 71, 83, 97, 102
—— Samaritans (E. B.), 222, 240
Curtis, E. L. and Madsen, A. A., Com. Chronicles, 46, 47, 191
Curtiss, S. I., Primitive Semitic Religion, 250
Cyril of Alexandria, 262

D

Dalman, G., Words of Jesus, 395
De Faye, 349
Derenbourg, J., 277, 307
—— Histoire de la Palestine, 30
Dillmann, 349
Dimont, C. T., Synoptists and Pharisees (Expos.), 108 f.
Driver, S.R., Com. Daniel, 99
—— Com. Deuteronomy, 46, 160
—— Com. Malachi, 206
—— Sabbath (H. D. B.), 119
Drummond, J., Philo Judaeus, 295
Duhm, Com. Jesaia, 91, 210

E

Eaton, D., Pharisees and Sadducees (H. D. B.), 26, 31, 40, 60, 83, 102, 112
Ecclesiasticus, 14
Edersheim, A., Life and Times of Jesus Christ, 30, 158, 275, 278, 312, 372

Eerdmans, B. D., Pharisees and Sadducees (Expos.), 36, 54, 56, 59, 73, 85
Elbogen, J., Religionsansch. der Pharisäer, 36, 146
Eleazar ben Amram, 264
Emmet, C. W., Messiah (E. R. E.), 85, 354
1 Enoch, 15, 275
Epiphanius, Haer, 30, 274, 322
Ermoni, V., 278
Essenes, 267–322
Eusebius, 262
—— Hist. Eccl. ii. 23; 170, 379
—— Praep. Evang., 273, 282 f., 286
Ewald, H., History of Israel, 275, 278, 281, 307, 322, 349
Ezra, date of, 215 ff.
Ezra-Nehemiah document, 215 f.

F

Fairbairn, A. M., Jesus and the Jews (Expos.), 113
Fairweather, W., Background of Gospels, 26, 312
—— Development of Doctrine (H. D. B.), 97, 99, 102
Frankel, 307
Friedländer, M., Die religiösen Bewegungen., 36, 150, 270, 283, 289 f., 307, 316, 320

G

Garrod, H. W., Religion of All Good Men, 320
Gaster, Moses, Ordination (Jewish) (E. R. E.), 46 f.
Geiger, A., 32, 35, 55, 58, 66, 68, 307
Ginsburg, C. D., The Essenes, 319
Ginzberg, Louis, Simon (J. E.), 49
Godet, F., 126
Gospels, Synoptic, 15
Gould, E. P., Com. Mark, 112, 126, 132, 140, 144, 158 f., 163 f., 351, 391
Graetz, History of the Jews, 20, 53, 102, 307, 342, 359
Gray, G. B., Angel (E. B.), 99
Gressmann, 210
Guthe, H., Israel (E. B.), 19, 38, 217
Gwatkin, H. M., Early Church History, 335

H

Hamburger, Real-Encycl., 30
Harnack, A., Expansion of Christianity, 165
—— American S. S. Times, art., 118
Hart, J. H. A., Sadducees (E. Brit.), 34
Hasidim (*vide* Chasidim)
Hausrath, A., Times of Jesus, 307, 360, 364
Headlam, A. C., Life and Teaching of Jesus Christ, 255
Hebrew Lexicon by B. D. B., 27
Hegesippus, 349
Herford, R. T., 36
—— Apoc. & Pseud., 49
—— Effect of Fall of Jerusalem on Jews, 176 f.
Herford, R. T., Pharisaism, 12, 111, 116, 127, 129
Herzfeld, 316
Hilgenfeld, 281, 307, 312
Hillel and Shammai, 64
Hillelites, 115, 133, 148 f.
Hirsch, E. G., Hillel (E. R. E.), 64
Hippolytus, 274, 285, 322
Hitzig, 278
Holmes, S., Wisdom of Solomon, 294
Hölscher, G., Der Sadduzäismus, 23, 33, 36, 54, 56, 63, 67, 101, 153 f., 171
Holtzmann, O., 255, 275, 372
Hort, F. J. A., Judaistic Christianity, 321, 395
Hughes, H. M., Anti-Zealotism (Expos. T.), 394
Huntingdon, Bishop, 235

J

Jackson, Foakes and Lake, K., Beginnings of Christianity, 40, 60, 229, 252, 279
Jerome, 70, 262
—— Com. Matthew, 30
Joseph, Morris, 125
Josephus, Bias of, 13
—— Writings of, 13, 274
Jost, 307
Jülicher, A., Essenes (E. B.), 278, 308, 316, 322
Juynboll, 264

K

Katibah, Dr. Daud, 250
Kautsch, E., 235
Keim, Jesus of Nazara, 277, 280 f., 316
Klostermann, 126
Knabenbauer, 391
Kohler, K., 68, 307, 359
—— Essenes (J. E.), 302
—— Jewish Theology, 100, 103, 105
—— Pharisees (J. E.), 11, 26
—— Sadducees (J. E.), 55, 71, 73, 106
Kosters, W. H., 195
—— Ezra (E. B.), 216
Krochmal, N., 55, 68
Kuenen, A., Religion of Israel, 31 f., 81, 280, 307, 343

L

Lagrange, M. J., 126, 217, 391
—— Com. Marc., 132, 140, 144, 147, 161
—— Com. Luc., 253, 395
—— Le Messianisme, 335, 379
Lake, Kirsopp, Stewardship of Faith, 328
Lauterbach, J. Z., 27, 36
—— J. Q. R. arts., 42, 43, 47, 50, 55
—— Studies in Jewish Literature, 28, 42, 45, 47, 50, 55, 68, 70, 81
Leszynsky, Rud., 27, 34, 36, 68
—— Die Sadduzäer, 55, 82 ff., 86, 96, 100, 102, 106
Lévi, 34
Leyrer, 364
Liberty, Stephen, Political Relations of Christ's Ministry, 389
Lightfoot, J. B., Com. Colos. and Phil., 270 f., 277, 301, 303, 306 f., 311 ff., 321

Lipsius, art. Essäier (in Schenkel's Bib. Lex.), 291, 309
Littmann, 210
Loewe, H. M. J., Judaism (E. R. E.), 81, 178
Loisy, A., 391
Lucius, Der Essenismus, 278, 301, 307 f.

M

Maccabees, Books of, 14 f.
Mackenzie, W. D., Jesus Christ (E.R.E.), 77
Mahaffy, J. P., Alexander's Empire, 310 f.
Mangey, 364
Margoliouth, D. S., Intro. to Works of Fl. Josephus, 389
Margoliouth, G., 34
Marka, 243
Marti, D. K., Com. Jesaia, 210
M'Neile, A. H., Com. Matthew, 126
Menzies, A., art. Hib. Journal, 147
Meyer, E., Entstehung d. Judenthums, 196
Meyer, H. A. W., Com. Acts, 376
Michaelis, 372
Micklem, P. A., Com. Matthew, 159, 164
Mills, Three Months' Residence at Nablus, etc., 246
Mitchell, Jos., Sadducees (D. C. G.), 83, 102
Mittwoch, E., 277
Moffatt, J., Essenes (E. R. E.), 304, 316
—— Historical New Testament, 321
—— Introd. Lit. of New Testament, 110 f.
—— Righteousness of Scribes and Phar. (Expos. T.), 65
—— Scribes (E. R. E.), 47
Mommsen, Th., Provinces of the Roman Empire, 335, 339, 367, 371
Montefiore, C. G., art. Hib. Journal, 123
—— Religious teaching of Jesus, 121, 124, 147
—— Synoptic Gospels, 115, 121, 123, 126, 129, 135, 139, 141, 144, 150
Montet, Essai sur les origines, etc., 31 f.
Montgomery, J. A., The Samaritans, 183, 195, 202, 222, 226, 234, 243, 246, 251, 258, 260, 264
Morinus, 262
Morrison, W. D., Jews under the Romans, 280, 306, 311, 331, 343
Moulton, J. H., Zoroastrianism (H. D. B.) 99, 313, 315 f.
Moulton, Warren J., Samaritans (E.R.E.) 221, 225, 237

N

Neumark, David, 100
Niese, B., Josephus (E. R. E.), 13
Niven, W. D., Pharisees and Sadducees (D. A. C.), 27, 97, 102
Nutt, J. W., Sketch of Samaritan History, 237

O

Oesterley, W. O. E., 27, 31
—— Books of the Apocrypha, 16, 28, 34, 70, 85 f., 97, 102
—— Com. Ecclesiasticus, 32
—— On 1 Macc. xii. 6., 50
Oesterley and Box, C. H., Religion and Worship of the Synagogue, 47, 125, 135
Ohle, R., 273
Origen, 70, 262

P

Peake, A. S., Com. Colossians, 322
—— Com. Job, 91
—— Unclean (H. D. B.), 122
Perles, Felix, Bousset's Relig. Jud. untersucht, 58
Petermann, Heinrich, 235
Peters, J. P., Religion of the Hebrews, 217, 223
Pharisees (and Sadducees), Literature of, 14 f.
Philo, 272, 277
Pietro della Valle, 235
Pliny, 274, 279
Plummer, A., Com. Luke, 126, 133, 162, 164, 391
Polyglott, Paris, 262
—— London, 262
Porphyry, 274
Porter, F. C., Apocrypha (H. D. B.), 275
Prince, J. D., Scribes and Pharisees (E. B.), 26, 47, 56, 59, 97, 102

R

Rabbinical Literature, 15
Rackham, R. B., Com. Acts, 169, 172
Ramsay, W. M., 372
—— Trustworthiness of New Testament, 259, 359
—— Was Christ born at Bethlehem? 359
Resch, 395
Reuss, Edouard, Christian Theology in the Apostolic Age, 307, 321
Ritschl, A., Über die Essener, 308
Robertson, A. T., Pharisees and Jesus, 27, 83
Rosenthal, 349
Rothstein, J. W., Juden u. Samaritaner, 197
Ryle and James, Psalms of Solomon, 63

S

Sachau, Elephantiné Papyri, 201
Sadducees, Literature of, 14
Sadducees (and Pharisees), 1–178
Samaritans, 179–265
Sayce, A. H., art. Sanballat, 200
Scaliger, Joseph, 235
Schechter, S., 34
—— Zadokite Fragments, 43, 51
—— art. Evasions of Law, 123
Schmidt and Merx, Die Assumptio Mosis, 276
Schmiedel, P. W., 372
Schrader, E., C. O. T., 187 f.
Schürer, E., 31, 35, 58, 66, 354, 364

Schürer, E., Jewish People in the Time of Jesus Christ, 26, 54, 57, 60, 67, 70 f., 81, 83, 97, 101 f., 150, 273, 278, 304, 308, 310 f., 316 f., 344, 349, 359
Scott, H. M., Pharisees (D. C. G.), 112, 116
Segal, M. H., Pharisees and Sadducees (Expos.), 36, 54, 56, 59, 69, 71, 73, 102
Seinecke, 364
Sellin, 210
Shammaites, 133, 148 f.
Sibylline Oracles, 276
Sieffert, P. R. E. (3), 332
Simeon ben Gamaliel, 243
Skinner, J., Com. Isaiah, 208, 210
—— Divine Names in Genesis, 223
Smith, D., Days of His Flesh, 390, 395
Smith, G. A., Jerusalem, 46 ff., 201, 211
—— art. in Expositor, 194
Smith, J. M. P., Com. Malachi, 206
Smith, W. R., Messiah (E. Brit.), 346
Söderblom, 316
Solinus, 274
Solomon, Psalms of, 15
Sopherim (Scribes), 42 ff.
Stevens, G. B., Theology of New Testament, 118
Strauss, 254
Swete, H. B., Com. Mark, 126, 132, 139, 144, 157, 159, 161, 163, 391
Syncellus, 262
Synoptic Gospels, 15

T

Taylor, C., Sayings of the Jewish Fathers, 31, 70, 277
Testaments of the XII Patriarchs, 15
Thayer-Grimm, Lexicon New Testament, 138
Theudas, 372
Thomson, J. E. H., 183
Tidemann, R., 275
Titchmarsh, E. H., Zealot (D. C. G.), 391
Torrey, C. C., 195, 201
—— Compos. of Ezra-Nehemiah, 221, 225
Triglott, Barberini, 264

V

Van Hoonacker, 195, 217
Viteau, J., Les Psaumes de Salomon, 87, 94, 344, 346

W

Walton, 262
Weir, T. H., on Luke xx. 20 (Expos. T.), 160
Weizsäcker, C., Apostolic Age, 165 f.
Wellhausen, J., 35, 57, 66, 275, 333, 391
—— Die Pharisäer und Sadducäer, 53
—— Einleitung, 110
Wendt, H. H., Teaching of Jesus, 308
Wernle, P., Beginnings of Christianity, 116 f., 390
Westcott, B. F., Essenes (S. D. B.), 307
Whitehouse, O. C., Com. Isaiah, 208, 210
Wieseler, 349
Wright, A., Synopsis of the Gospels in Greek, 156

Z

Zadokite Fragment, 14, 56, 73
Zealots, 323–395
Zeller, 316, 318
Zenos, 349

B. REFERENCES TO OLD TESTAMENT

Genesis.	page
iii. 22	98
iv. 7	103
xi. 7	98
xii. 6	244
xiv. 17 ff.	244
xiv. 18 ff.	84
xx. 13	239
xxii. 2	244
xxxi. 53	239
xxxiii. 18 ff.	244
xxxv. 4	240
xxxv. 7	239
xxxviii. 8	160
xlviii. 16	240
xlix. 10	84

Exodus	
iii. 2, 6	161
iii. 6	91
vi. 18	236
xv. 3	240
xix. 4	103
xix. 5	308
xix. 6	84, 308
xxiii. 28	241
xxiv. 10 f.	240
xxviii. 30	103

Leviticus.	
xv. 16–18	308
xvi. 2	73
xvi. 8 f.	103
xxiv. 12	27

Numbers.	
iv. 28	32
xxii. 20	240
xxiii. 4 f.	240
xxiv. 7	354
xxvi. 56	103
xxviii. 4	73

Deuteronomy.	
vi. 4–7	150
xi. 29, 32	244
xvii. 8 ff.	81
xvii. 9, 12	46
xviii. 15	248
xix. 17	46
xxiii. 11 f.	308
xxv. 5–10	160
xxvi. 1–15	106
xxvii. 11, 12	244
xxx. 15–19	103
xxxii. 11 f.	103
xxxiii. 16 f.	248
xxxiv. 10	241 f.
xxxvii. 4	245

Joshua.	page
viii. 33 f.	244
xxiv. 32	244

Judges.	
ix. 7–21	245

Ruth.	
Ruth	213

2 Samuel.	
xxiv. 1	298

1 Kings.	
i. 8, 26, 32 ff.	31
ii. 35	31
iv. 4	31
xii.	245
xii. 21–24	221
xv. 3 f.	221
xvi. 24	185
xxii. 19–22	98

2 Kings.	
ii. 12	98
vi. 17	98
xv. 29	187
xvii. 6, 18, 19, 20	187 f.
xvii. 29	185
xxiii. 5, 11	313
xxiii. 15, 19	192

1 Chronicles.	
ii. 55	47
v. 26	187
xxiv. 4–6	32
xxix. 22	31

2 Chronicles.	
xi.	221
xiii. 4–12	221
xvi. 12	305
xvii. 7–9	46
xix. 8–11	46, 50
xxv. 7	221
xxx. 1, 5, 10 f.	191
xxxi. 1	191
xxxiv. 6, 9	192
xxxv. 17 f.	192

Ezra.	
iii. 2–5, 10	195
iii. 8 ff.	197
iv. 1 ff.	197
iv. 1, 4, 10	190
iv. 1, 4, 24	195
iv. 1–5, 24	195
iv. 2	201, 209
iv. 6, 23	198 f.

	page
iv. 7, 9 f.	200
iv. 7–23	195 f., 198
v.–vi. 18	195
vii. 8	216
ix. 1	46
ix. 2 ff.	207
ix. 9	217
x.	36 f.
x. 6, 11 f.	217
x. 8, 14	46
x. 18 f.	207

Nehemiah.	
i. 3	199
ii. 10, 19	200 f.
ii. 10–vii. 5	200
ii. 19	202
ii. 20	202
iv. 1, 7	200
iv. 3, 7	201
vi. 1, 2, 5, 12, 14	200
vi. 1, 2, 6	201
vi. 1, 12, 14, 17–19	201
viii. 8	28
x. 30	207
xii. 11, 22, 26	217
xiii. 4, 7 f.	201
xiii. 23 ff.	37, 207, 221
xiii. 23–31	37
xiii. 25	214, 217
xiii. 28	37, 217 f.

Job.	
i. 21	294
vii. 9 f.	91
xiv. 7 ff.	91
xix. 26 f.	91

Psalms.	
vi. 5	92
xlix.	91
lxxiii.	91
cviii. 22 f.	159
cxxxix. 13–15	294

Ecclesiastes.	
ix. 5	93

Isaiah.	
vi. 2, 6	98
xxiv. 21	99
xxiv.–xxvii.	85
xxvi. 19	91
lvi. 3, 6 f.	207
lvii. 3-13, 19	208
lxiii. 7–lxiv. 12	209 f.
lxv. 1 f.	208
lxv. 3–5, 11	208, 211

	PAGE
lxvi. 1 f.	211
lxvi. 3 f.	208
lxvii. 3–13	208
JEREMIAH.	
vi. 21	298
xxi. 8	103
xli. 5	192
EZEKIEL.	
iii. 20	298
viii. 16	303
x.	98
xl. 2	98
xl. 46	32
xliii. 19	32
xliv. 2	98
xliv. 15 ff.	32, 84
xlviii. 11	32
DANIEL.	
Daniel	85
viii. 16	98, 298
ix. 21	98, 298
x. 13, 21	98 f., 298
xi. 1	99
xii. 1	98 f., 298
xii. 1–3	295
xii. 2	92
JOEL.	
Joel	85
HAGGAI.	
Haggai	195
i. 6–11	197
ii. 10–14	197
ii. 11	45
ZECHARIAH.	
i.–viii.	195
x. 2	305
xiii. 2–6	176
MALACHI.	
i. 11, 14	206
ii. 7	45
ii. 10 ff.	207
iv. 5 f.	247

C. REFERENCES TO NEW TESTAMENT

ST. MATTHEW. PAGE

iii. 2 . . . 351
iii. 7 . . 72, 105, 155 f.
iii. 10, 12 . . . 390
iv. 1–11 . . . 389
v. . . . 130
v. 17–20 . 70, 117
v. 17–vi. 18 . . 109
v. 17 . . 116 f.
v. 18 . . . 117
v. 21–48 . 118 f.
v. 39 . . . 394
vi. 2 ff. . . 109
vii. 5 . . . 139
vii. 21 . . . 130
vii. 28 f. . . 127
viii. 29 . . . 130
ix. 2–8 . . . 125
ix. 9–13 . . 113
ix. 10 f. . . 340
ix. 11, 14 . . 59
ix. 13, 36 . . 142
ix. 13 . . . 147
ix. 17 . . . 119
ix. 27 . . 88, 351
ix. 34 . . . 132
x. 3 . . . 391
x. 5 . .251 f., 255
x. 6 . . . 142
x. 22 . . . 394
x. 32 f. . . . 130
xi. 2–19 . . 390
xi. 3 . . . 351
xi. 12 f. . 119, 395
xi. 18 f. . . 143
xi. 19 . . . 113
xii. 1–5 . . 120
xii. 1–14 . 119, 137
xii. 2, 10 . . 59
xii. 7 . . . 138
xii. 10, 24, 38 f. . 132
xii. 14 . . 133 f.
xii. 22–37 . . 144
xii. 23 . . . 88
xiii. 12 . . . 143
xiii. 52 . . 119, 148
xiii. 54–58 . . 128
xv. 1 . 59, 82, 132
xv. 1–20 . 121, 137
xv. 2 . . 57, 70
xv. 2, 3, 6 79, 118
xv. 7 . . . 139
xv. 14 . . 109, 143
xv. 22 . . . 88
xvi. 1 . . 105, 132
xvi. 1, 6, 11 f. . 72
xvi. 5–12 . . 156
xvi. 6, 11 . . 140
xvii. 10 . . . 351

PAGE

xvii. 24 ff. . . . 117
xvii. 27 . . . 122
xix. 3 132
xix. 12 . . . 320
xix. 28 . . . 394
xx. 1–16 . . . 136
xx. 20–28 . . 392
xxi. 1–9 . . 393
xxi 12–16 . . 157
xxi. 23–27 . . 158
xxi. 25, 32 . 155 f.
xxi. 31 f. . . 113
xxi. 33–46 . . 159
xxi. 45 . . . 134
xxii. 15–22 145, 159, 392
xxii. 16 . . 133
xxii. 18 . . 139
xxii. 23 . . 89
xxii. 23–33 . 72 f., 160
xxii. 40 . . 117
xxiii. 3 . . . 117
xxiii. 5, 6, 23 . 59
xxiii. 5 f. . . 143
xxiii. 6 f. . . 140
xxiii. 16, 24 . . 109
xxiii. 23 . 119, 150
xxiv. 5, 11 . . 352
xxv. 29 . . 143
xxvi. 1, 14 ff. . 162
xxvi. 3, 62 f. . . 134
xxvi. 47 . . 341
xxvi. 47 ff., 57 ff. . 163
xxvi. 51 . . 391
xxvi. 64 . . 131
xxvii. 1, 11 ff., 43, 164
xxvii. 40, 43, 54 . 131
xxvii. 41 ff., 62 ff. 163 f.
xxviii. 11 ff. . . 164
xxviii. 19 . . 252

ST. MARK.

i. 5 . . . 155
i. 7 . . . 351
i. 22 . 12, 111, 127
i. 27 . . . 127
i. 34, 38 . . 393
i. 44 . . . 117
ii. 3–12 . . 125
ii. 5–7 . . . 111
ii. 6 . . . 131
ii. 7 . . . 129
ii. 13–17 . . 113
ii. 16 . . . 57
ii. 16, 18, 23 f. . 111
ii. 17 . . . 113
ii. 21–28 . . 119
ii. 23–iii. 6 . . 137
ii. 25, 27 . . 120

PAGE

ii. 27 f. . . . 121
ii.–iii. 6 . . . 113
iii. 1–6 . . . 119
iii. 2, 22 . . . 132
iii. 4 121
iii. 5 138
iii. 6 . . 133 f.
iii. 11, 35 . . 130
iii. 13 ff. . . 253
iii. 18 . . . 391
iii. 20–30 . . 144
iv. 28 . . . 143
vi. 1–6 . . . 128
vii. 1 . . 132, 149
vii. 1–23 . 121, 137
vii. 3 . 57, 70, 79
vii. 5 ff. . 79, 82
vii. 5, 9, 13 . . 118
vii. 6 ff. . 109, 139
vii. 8, 9, 13 . . 79
vii. 13 . . . 117
viii. 11 . . 128, 132
viii. 11–13 . . 109
viii. 14–21 . . 156
viii. 15 . . . 140
viii. 28 . . . 351
ix. 11 . . . 351
x. 2 132
x. 17 ff. . . . 117
x. 28–31 . . 394
x. 35–45 . . 392
xi. 1–10 . 352, 393
xi. 10 . . 88, 128
xi. 12 . . . 353
xi. 15–18 . 157, 162
xi. 27 . 134, 146, 159
xi. 27 ff. . . 143
xi. 27–33 . . 158
xii. 1–12, 13–17 . 159
xii. 12 130, 134, 146, 162
xii. 13 ff. . . 133
xii. 13–17 . 145, 392
xii. 14 ff. . . 60
xii. 15 . . . 139
xii. 18 . . . 89
xii. 18–27 . 153, 160
xii. 26 f. . . 91
xii. 28 . . . 161
xii. 34 . . . 148
xii. 35–37 . . 351
xii. 38–40 . . 140
xiii. 1–37 . . 352
xiii. 21 f. . . 394
xiii. 21–23 . . 352
xiv. 1 f. . . 162
xiv. 1, 10 f. . 134, 162
xiv. 43 ff., 53 ff. . 163
xiv. 47 . . 391

PAGE

xiv. 61 f. . 129, 131
xiv. 62 f. . . 129
xv. 1 ff. . . 164
xv. 2 . . 129, 351
xv. 31 f. . . 164
xv. 43 . . . 350

St. Luke.

i. 6 ff. . . . 63
i. 19, 26 . . 98
ii. 2 . . . 359
ii. 22–38 . . 350
iii. 15 . . . 351
iv. 1–12 . . 389
iv. 17–30 . . 128
iv. 36 . . . 127
iv. 41 . . . 130
v. 14 . . . 122
v. 17 . . . 131
v. 17–26 . . 125
v. 21 . . . 111
v. 27–32 . . 113
v. 30 . . . 57
v. 37 . . . 119
v. 39 . . . 128
vi. 1–11 . 119, 137
vi. 6 ff. . . 253
vi. 7 . . . 132
vi. 11 . . . 133
vi. 15 . 329, 352, 391
vi. 39, 42 . . 109
vi. 42 . . . 139
vi. 46 . . . 130
vii. 18–35 . . 390
vii. 19 . . . 351
vii. 29, 34, 39 . 113
vii. 30 . . 143, 155 f.
vii. 33 f. . . 143
vii. 47 . . . 125
viii. 18 . . . 143
viii. 28 . . . 130
ix. 51 ff. . . 253
ix. 52 ff. . . 251
ix. 53, 54 . . 252
ix. 54 f. . . 392
x. 25 ff. . 251, 254
x. 37 . . . 252
xi. 14, 15 . . 132
xi. 14–26 . . 144
xi. 37–41 . . 121
xi. 37–54 . . 109
xi. 38 . . . 82
xi. 42 . . . 119
xii. 1 . . 109, 140
xii. 1 ff. . . 157
xii. 1, 8 . . 130
xii. 1–12 . . 144
xiii. 1 . . . 365
xiii. 1–3 . . 394
xiii. 10–17 . . 119
xiii. 14–17 . . 137
xiii. 15 . . . 120
xiii. 15 f. . . 138
xiii. 31, 33 . . 133

PAGE

xiv. 1 . . . 132
xiv. 1–6 . . 119, 137
xv. 1 f. . . 113, 115
xv. 7 . . . 142
xvi. 14 . . . 109
xvi. 16 . 119, 353, 395
xvi. 17 . . . 117
xvii. 10 . . 136
xvii. 11 ff. . 251, 254
xvii. 18 . . 252
xviii. 9–14 . 136, 141
xviii. 10 ff. . 148
xviii. 28–30 . 394
xix. 1–9 . . 113
xix. 8 . . . 340
xix. 12, 14 . . 358
xix. 26 . . . 143
xix. 29–38 . . 393
xix. 45–47 . . 157
xx. 1–8 . . 158
xx. 2, 20 . . 134
xx. 9–19 . . 159
xx. 19 . . . 134
xx. 19–26 . . 392
xx. 20 . . . 132
xx. 20 f. . . 139
xx. 20–26 . . 145
xx. 27 f. . 89, 153
xx. 27–40 . . 160
xx. 45 ff. . . 140
xxi. 8 . . . 352
xxi. 19 . . . 394
xxii. 1 f., 3 ff. . 162
xxii. 2 . . . 134
xxii. 29 f. . . 394
xxii. 38, 49 . . 391
xxii. 47, 54, 66 ff. . 163
xxii. 67, 70 . . 164
xxii. 70 . . . 131
xxiii. 1 ff., 13 ff. . 164
xxiii. 2 . . . 365
xxiii. 19 . . 365
xxiii. 35 . . 164
xxiii. 51 . . 350
xxiv. 21 . . 352

St. John.

iii. 147
iv. 4–42 . 251, 254
iv. 8 f. . . 243, 252
iv. 20 . . . 244
iv. 25 . . 247, 350
v. 2–18 . . 119
vi. 15 . . 353, 393
vii. 41 . . . 351
vii. 49 . . 30, 142
viii. 48 . 251 f., 256
ix. 1–41 . . 119
ix. 2, 34 . . 295
x. 36 . . . 163
xii. 12–15 . . 393
xviii. 31 . . 341
xviii. 36 . . 393

Acts. PAGE

i. 6 f. . . 353, 394
i. 8 . . 252 f., 258
i. 13 . . 329, 391
iii. 15, 17 . . 166
iii. 17 . . . 172
iv. 1 . . . 67
iv. 1 f. . . . 89
iv. 1 ff. . . 165
iv. 2 . . . 72
iv. 2, 10, 21 . . 172
v. 17 . . 23, 67
v. 17–42 . . 166
v. 17, 26, 28 . . 172
v. 21 . . . 341
v. 34 ff. . . 151
v. 36 . . 353, 372
v. 37 . . 353, 359
v. 39 f. . . . 105
vi. 11 . . . 151
vi. 12–viii. 3 . . 167
vii. 16 . . . 244
viii. 1 . . . 168
viii. 1–3 . . 151
viii. 1, 14 . . 169
viii. 4–25 . 252, 258
viii. 9 ff. . . 246
ix. 31 . . 252, 260
xii. 369
xv. 3 . . 252, 260
xv. 5 . . 109, 151
xxi. 38 . 329, 353, 377
xxii. 3 . . . 57
xxii. 30–xxiii. 10 . 168
xxiii. 1 ff. . . 67
xxiii. 8 . 72, 89, 96 f., 100
xxiii. 9 . . 57, 152
xxiii. 12 . . 376
xxiii. 14 f. . . 169
xxiv. 1 ff. . . 168
xxiv. 5 f., 26 . 377 f.
xxv. 2 . . . 168
xxv. 2 f. . . 169
xxv. 3 . . . 376
xxvi. 5 . . . 57

1 Corinthians.

ix. 26 297

2 Corinthians.

v. 4 297

Galatians.

i. 14 70

Philippians.

iii. 5 57

Colossians.

ii. 8 70

Jude.

9 98

Revelation.

i. 6 84
v. 10 84
xii. 7 98

D. REFERENCES TO APOCRYPHA AND PSEUDEPIGRAPHA

PAGE

ABRAHAM, APOC. OF.
ix., xiii., xxii., xxvi. 276
xxii., xxvi. . . 300

1 BARUCH.
vi. 7 . . . 298

2 BARUCH (APOC.)
xxvii.–xxx. 1; xxxvi.–xl.; liii.–lxxiv. . . . 354
xxix. 5 f.; xxxix. 7; xl. 1-4. . 355
lxxii. 2 . . 355

ECCLESIASTICUS.
Ecclesiasticus . 85
vi. 33 ff.; ix. 14 ff.; xiv. 20 ff. . . 49
xi. 14–28 . . 103
xiv. 23–25 . . 86
xv. 11–20 . 103, 299
xvii. 27 f. . . 92
xviii. 8–11 . . 92
xxii. 11 . . 92
xxxviii. 1–4 . . 306
xxxviii. 24–xxxix. 11 . . . 42, 49
xliv. 14 . . 92
l. 25 f. . . . 230
li. 12 ff. . . 32

ENOCH (ETHIOPIC).
i.–xxxvi. . . 85, 93
v. 4 70
vi., lxix., lxxiii., xcviii., cviii. . 275
ix. 1, 10 . . 99, 298
xv. 2 . . . 99
xv. 4 ff. . . 161
xx. 1–7 . 99, 298
xxvii. 2 f. . . 61
xxxvii.–lxx. . . 93
xxxviii. 2, 5 . . 61
xl. 2–10 . . 99
xlvii. 1 f. . . 61
xlviii. 9 . . 61
liii. 3 . . . 99
lxxii. 12 . . 61
lxxxiii.–xc. . . 93
xc. 6 . . . 51
xc. 6, 7 . . 40
xc. 26 f. . . 61
xci.-civ. . . 295
xciv. 5 . . . 61
xcv. 3 . . . 61
xcviii. 4 . . 104
xcviii. 15 . . 61
xcix. 2 . . 70
xcix. 2, 7 f. . . 61
c. 6 . . . 61
ci. 1 . . . 61
cii. 9 . . . 61
civ. 10 . . . 61
cviii. 7 ff. . . 288

ENOCH, SECRETS OF.
xxiii. 5 . . . 294

1 ESDRAS. PAGE
v. 66–73 . . 195

2 (4) ESDRAS.
iv. 1, 36 . 99, 298
v. 16 . . . 298

JUBILEES.
Jubilees . . 85
xvi. 18 . . 84
xxiii. 31 . . 93
xxxiii. 20 . . 84

1 MACCABEES.
i. 11 ff., 62 f. . 39 f.
ii. 1–28 . . 80
ii. 32 ff., 42 . 40, 51
ii. 32–41 . . 80
ii. 57 . . . 87
iii. 13 . . . 51
iii. 21, 29 . . 80
vi. 59 . . . 80
vii. 12 f. . 40, 56
viii. 17 . . 41, 333
x. 26 ff., 65 . . 41
xi. 27 f., 57 ff. . 41
xii. 1 ff. . 41, 333
xiv. 8–15 . . 336
xiv. 17 f. . . 333
xiv. 24, 38, 41–47 41

2 MACCABEES.
ii. 17 . . . 84
iv. 14 f. . . 39
vi. 1–3 . . . 229
vi. 18 ff. . . 40
vii. 10 f., 14, 22 f. . 94
xi. 6 . . . 99
xiv. 38 . . . 40
xiv. 46 . . . 94

4 MACCABEES.
ix. 8 f. . . . 296
xviii. 23 . . 294

MOSES, ASSUMPTION OF.
i. 14 . . . 294
i. 21 . . . 276
v. 2 . . 40, 51
ix. 6, 7 . . . 348
x. 2 . . . 349
x. 8–10 . . 349
xii. 10–12 . . 349

SIBYLLINE ORACLES.
i. 21; iii. 576 ff. . 276
iv. 8 ff., 25 f., 28 ff., 165 276
iv. 28 f. . . 301

SOLOMON, PSALMS OF.
i. 20
i. 8 . . . 62
ii. 20
ii. 3–5, 13–15, 37, 38 62
iii. 3–18 . . 62
iii. 13 f., 16 . . 94
iii. 16 . . . 65
iv. 1, 4, 7–24 . 62
iv. 7 . . . 138
v. 2, 13 . . 62
v. 2, 15–17 . . 65
v. 6 . . . 104

PAGE
vi. 1–3, 8, 9 . . 65
vii. 2 . . . 62
viii. . . . 20
viii. 9, 13, 24, 26 . 62
viii. 12–19 . . 20
viii. 12 . . . 60
ix. 7 f. . . . 104
x. 2 . . . 65
x. 9 . . . 94
xii. 2, 4, 6 . . 62
xii. 8 . . . 94
xiv. 4 ff. . . 62
xiv. 6 . . . 94
xv. 6 . . . 62
xv. 11–14 . . 62
xvii. . . . 20
xvii. 5 ff. . . 60
xvii. 5, 8, 23 . . 87
xvii. 7 ff. . . 62
xvii. 18, 51 . . 62
xvii. 23–27, 38–42 . 345
xvii. 23, 35 f., 47 . 346
xviii. 6 . . . 346

SOLOMON, WISDOM OF
i. 14 . . . 297
iii. 1–4 . . . 295
v. 15 . . . 295
viii. 19 . . . 294
ix. 15 . . . 297
xvi. 28 . . . 303

TESTAMENTS OF XII PATRIARCHS.
Benjamin.
x. 7 ff. . . . 94
Dan.
v. 10, 11 . . 86
vi. 2 . . . 99
Joseph.
xix. 5–9 . . 86
Judah.
xxiv. 1 ff. . 86, 344
xxiv. 5 f. . . 87
Levi.
v. 6 . . . 99
vii. 2 . . . 230
viii. 14 . . 86, 344
xviii. . . . 86
Reuben.
vi. 7–12 86 f., 344

TOBIT.
iii. 17 . . 99, 298
xii. 12, 15 . . 99
xii. 15 . . 99, 298

ZADOKITE FRAGMENTS.
i. 4, 5 . . . 51
i. 5 . . . 40
ii. 6, 10 . 104, 347
iii. 7 . . . 104
iv. 2, 10 . . 104
v. 6 . . . 95
viii. 3–6 . . 51
ix. 10, 29*b* . . 88
ix. 10*b* . . 347
xv. 4*a* . . . 88

E. REFERENCES TO JOSEPHUS

ANTIQUITIES.

Bk. Chap. Sec.	PAGE
IX. xiv. 3	229
X. xi. 7	105
XI. iv. 8	38
XI. vii. 1	210
XI. vii. 2	200, 219
XI. viii. 2	37
XI. viii. 2, 4	245
XI. viii. 2–7	219
XI. viii. 4, 6	227
XI. viii. 6	229
XI. viii. 7	249
XII. iii. 3	43, 50
XII. iv. 1	228
XII. v. 1	39
XII. v. 5	229
XII. x. 6	333
XIII. v. 9	14, 17, 101, 105, 279, 299
XIII. ix. 1	231, 245
XIII. ix. 2	333
XIII. x. 3	230 f.
XIII. x. 5, 6	18, 58
XIII. x. 6	57, 66, 70, 72, 79
XIII. xi. 1	87
XIII. xi. 2	279, 282, 304
XIII. xv. 5	18, 87
XIII. xvi. 2	18 f., 57, 79
XIV. i. 2	20
XIV. iii. 2	20
XIV. iv. 2	80
XIV. iv. 4	232
XIV. v. 3	232
XIV. ix. 3–5	335
XIV. ix. 4	60
XV. i. 1	60
XV. iii. 1	20
XV. viii. 5	232
XV. x. 4	60, 105
XV. x. 5	304
XV. xi. 5 f.	337
XVII. ii. 4	21 f., 57 ff.
XVII. vi. 3	357
XVII. xi. 2	338, 358
XVII. xiii. 3	305
XVII. xiii. 5	339
XVIII. i. 1	360
XVIII. i. 1, 6	60
XVIII. i. 2	14, 72
XVIII. i. 3	57 f., 101
XVIII. i. 3, 4, 5	90
XVIII. i. 3, 5	299 f.
XVIII. i. 4	23, 58, 66, 70
XVIII. i. 6	330
XVIII. ii. 2	233, 361
XVIII. iv. 1 f.	233, 246
XVIII. iv. 2	232, 339
XVIII. iv. 3	366
XVIII. v. 3	366
XVIII. vi. 5	362
XVIII. vii. 2	367 f.
XVIII. viii.	368
XIX. i.	368
XIX. ii. 5	367 f.
XIX. v. 2, 3	369
XX. ii. 3	372
XX. v. 1 f.	372
XX. v. 2, 3	360
XX. vi. 1	253, 374 f.
XX. vi. 1–3	233
XX. vi. 2 f.	339
XX. viii. 5	376
XX. viii. 6	377
XX. viii. 8	69, 377
XX. viii. 11	378
XX. ix. 1	23, 72, 170
XX. ix. 2	69
XX. ix. 4	380
XX. x.	38, 342

WAR.

Bk. Chap. Sec.	PAGE
I. ii. 6 f.	231, 245
I. iii. 5	279, 282, 304
I. vi. 3 f.	334
I. vii. 7	232
I. viii. 4	232
I. x. 6–9	335
I. xxi. 2	232
II. vi. 2	358
II. vii. 3	282, 305
II. viii. 1	60, 360
II. viii. 2	283
II. viii. 4	282
II. viii. 5	286 f., 302
II. viii. 6	284, 305
II. viii. 7	275, 284, 297
II. viii. 9	303
II. viii. 10, 11	293
II. viii. 12	304
II. viii. 14	14, 28, 57, 72, 89, 101, 299
II. x.	368
II. xi. 6	371
II. xii. 3–7	233
II. xiii. 2	374
II. xiii. 3	376
II. xiii. 6	376
II. xiv. 1	380 f.
II. xiv. 2	381
II. xiv. 3, 4–6	382 f.
II. xvii. 2	384
II. xvii. 6	329
II. xvii. 7–10	385
II. xix. 2–9	385
II. xx. 4	285
III. ii. 1	285
III. vii. 32	234
IV. iii. 9	329 f.
IV. iii.–vi.	386
IV. v. 2	72
IV. ix. 1 ff.	386
V. iv. 2	282
V. v. 6	387
VI. v. 2 ff.	386
VI. v. 4	356
VI. ix. 3	360
VII. viii. 1	330

LIFE.

§ 1	67
§ 2	105, 272
§ 38	57
§ 39	63
§ 44	63

F. REFERENCES TO OTHER LITERATURE

CLEMENTINE HOMILIES. PAGE
i. 15 259
ii. 22 259

EPIPHANIUS.
Against Heresies, xix. 2; xx. 3; xxx. 3 322

EUSEBIUS.
Hist. Eccles. ii. 23 . 170, 379
Praeparatio Evangelica, 273, 282 f., 286

HIPPOLYTUS.
Refutation of all Heresies, ix. 8–12 322

IRENAEUS.
Against Heresies, i. 23 . . 259

MARTYR, JUSTIN.
Apol. i. 26, 56 259
—— i. 53 246

MISHNAH.
Berakhoth, ix. 14*b* . . . 148
—— 81 240
Cholin, 4*a* 243
—— 6*a* 240
Eduyyoth, iv. 1 64
Erubin 119
Hagiga, iii. 5 73
Kiddushin 28
Pirké Aboth, ii. 10 . . . 63
—— iii. 2 63
—— v. 11 80
Sanhedrin, x. 1 90
—— xi. 3 . . . . 57, 79
—— 23*a* 114
Shabbath, xii. 1 120
—— 119
—— 14*b* 148
Sotah (Jer.), 22*b* . . . 148, 262
Taanith, 23*a* . . . 19, 81
Toharoth (Purifications) . 122
Yadajim 73

ORIGEN. PAGE
Contra Celsum 372

PHILO.
de Agricultura 296
de Execrationibus . . . 353
de Gigantibus 296
de Migrat. Abr. 296
de Praemiis et Poenis . . 354
de Vita contemplativa . . 303
Legatio ad Caium . . 362, 368
Leg. Alleg. 295
Quod det. pot. 296
Quod omnis probus 282, 287 f., 290, 300
Quoted by Euseb. Praep. Evang. 282 f., 286

PLINY.
Historia Naturalis . . 271 f., 283

PORPHYRY.
Abstinence from Food . . 274

SOLINUS.
Polyhistor. 274

SUETONIUS.
Caligula, §§24, 30 . . 367 f.
Tiberius, §36 361

SYNCELLUS.
Chronog. 262

TACITUS.
Annales, ii. 42 f. 361
—— ii. 42; vi. 16 f. . . . 340
—— vi. 32 339
—— xii. 54 . . . . 339, 375
Historia, v. 9 375

TERTULLIAN.
Apol. c. xiii. 259
—— xvi. 303

DATE DUE

BM
175
.A1
L5

UNITED THEOLOGICAL

United Theological Seminary Library
MAIN BM175.A1 L5
Lightley, Joh Jewish sects and parties i
3 0645 0003 7011 0